NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 07994424 9

Clelland, J.
ZHEF
~~512 G~~

THE

TRIAL AND ACQUITTAL

OF

JOHN THE BAPTIST,

THE

APOSTLES, AND EVANGELISTS,

UNDER THE CHARGE OF

DIPPING AND PLUNGING

PERSONS UNDER WATER, IN THE OFFICIAL ACTS OF THEIR RESPECTIVE ADMINISTRATIONS.

BY THOMAS CLELLAND, D.D.

LOUISVILLE:

MORTON & GRISWOLD.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1853, by
JOHN L. SMEDLEY & THOMAS CLELAND,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Kentucky.

Stereotyped and Printed by
MORTON & GRISWOLD,
Louisville, Ky.

PREFACE.

THIS little book is not written for the learned, the critic, or the aged Doctor of Divinity; nor is it written for the great mass of the inferior classes, who have little time and less capacity for close thinking, or investigation. It is rather intended for the middle class of young persons, especially young clergymen, who feel a deeper interest in the subject, and desire some small manual on a theme of great interest and frequent occurrence. A number of the Author's friends have long desired, and requested, something of the kind at his hands before the close of his ministerial life.

The forensic, or juridical form, is chosen for the sake of variety. Amid such an endless catalogue of books on this subject, it was thought that one more might come forth in a costume somewhat different, so far as the author knows, from the rest, hoping, thereby, it might be the more attractive.

The book is limited to one subject only — the *import* and Scriptural *mode* of Christian baptism; and likewise restricted, in the arguments and proofs, exclusively to

the Bible. This will greatly relieve the reader from the incumbrance and confusion of the great mass of human authorities, piled up like mountains, under the titles of Lexicographers, Greek Classics, Commentaries, Pedo-Baptist Concessions, &c., &c., comprising, by extracts, nearly two-thirds of many of the books written on this long controverted subject. Only let some men out of the Bible, in this controversy, and it is like letting a wild horse out into a thousand acre forest land — you may run him for more than a week and not head him. He will baffle and perplex you all the time.

The Baptist side of the question, it was not the author's intention to argue *in extenso*. Indeed it is necessarily limited, when confined exclusively to the Bible. Upon that course their race is soon run. In what has been said by their representative, Mr. WATERMAN, the utmost fairness has been aimed at. The argument, it is believed, is as pointed as themselves can make it, being measurably in their own words and language. At any rate, we have the substance fully.

The subject of Infant Baptism makes no part of the book; not because there is lacking either proof or argument equally strong to substantiate that subject; but because it was the author's wish to keep his book within as small limits as possible, unincumbered by any other subject. The important subject alluded to can be seen elsewhere at pleasure, by different authors, and abler hands.

It became necessary to appeal, occasionally, to the original Scriptures, especially the New Testament, to know exactly the mind of God on this important topic. And when compelled to this resort, it has been done with as much brevity as possible; accompanied, at the same time, with explanations, such as the common reader may readily understand.

The author acknowledges himself indebted to abler hands for light and assistance, on several points in the progress of this discussion; particularly to Professor STUART, Drs. E. BEECHER, HALL, and PETERS, who have handled this subject with great ability. When quotations could be distinctly made, it has been done, without special reference to the author's name. Occasional thoughts, and even words, are sometimes used in such connection, that no distinct reference or quotation could be accurately made. The object of the author was not wealth, fame, or applause, but simply the truth, no matter whence it came, so it appears in its plainest garb, and in its brightest light.

THE

TRIAL AND ACQUITTAL

OF

JOHN THE BAPTIST,

THE

APOSTLES AND EVANGELISTS.

The appointed day arrived. The weather was fine, and the occasion inviting. The Court assembled, and was organized as follows: —

On the bench, Judge Wiseman.

The Jury. — Mr. Lovetruth, Mr. Aimwell, Mr. Honest, Mr. Trueman, Mr. Allheart, Mr. Steadyman, Mr. Faithful, Mr. Goodheart, Mr. Candid, Mr. Liberalmind, Mr. Clearhead, and Mr. Commonsense.

The Charge. — In the name of the Commonwealth of Israel — John the Baptist, all the Apostles, with Philip and Annanias, are hereby

charged with Malfeasance and high Misdemeanor, for dipping and plunging men and women under water, in the official acts of their several administrations.

For the Commonwealth, and against the accused, Mr. WATERMAN.

For the defendants, Mr. SYMBOLICUS.

Judge WISEMAN. — *Gentlemen of the Jury and of the Bar:* The rules agreed upon by the gentlemen of the Bar, and submitted to the Court in the case before us, are, that the parties in their arguments and proofs are restricted exclusively to the Bible, and likewise to the *import* or meaning of baptism, with the Scriptural *mode* of its administration. From this course you will not unnecessarily depart; and in so doing, there will be less complication and confusion; the field being so limited, you will the sooner pervade it, and more speedily accomplish the important object before you. The gentleman in affirmative will proceed.

Mr. WATERMAN. — May it please your honor, and you, gentlemen of the Jury — I rise before you on the present occasion with no small degree

of emotion, anxiety, and feeling of interest and pleasure. I feel assured that I stand before an enlightened Court, both Judge and Jury, who will do ample justice to all concerned, by an impartial course and honest verdict. And furthermore, the issue of the case involves an important principle; and must, on one side or the other, effect an entire revolution in the administration of an outward Christian rite, respecting which the contending parties have so long and so vigorously occupied an antagonistic position.

As the Saviour's will is our only rule in baptism, and as that will is revealed in the Bible alone, we must resort to the Bible to ascertain what is baptism — what is the *import* as well as the proper *mode* of this rite. We adhere steadfastly to the great Protestant principle, that the Bible is the sole and sufficient rule in religious concerns. We accordingly appeal to the Scriptures, and at every step adopt the maxim of Chillingworth, "The Bible, the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants." So that if any practice, claiming to be a positive Christian rite,

is not clearly sanctioned by the Bible, it must be rejected, whatever arguments may be produced in its favor from supposed analogy, or from the practice of some portions of the Christian world.

We believe, moreover, that baptism is a *specified* rite, having, as to its essence, one unvarying character; and that as there is but "one Lord," and "one faith," so there is, in the same literal, numerical sense, but "one baptism." Eph. iv, 5. Baptism being not only a specified rite, but likewise a positive institution, and the obligation to practice it arising wholly from the authority of the Saviour, we must obey the precept exactly as it was to be observed. And, consequently, if we can ascertain what the Lord Jesus meant by baptism, that, and that only, we must practice, without hesitation or change.

It is evident, at a glance, that the turning point in this controversy is the meaning of the Greek word *baptizo*, which stands in our Bibles with an English termination. This word has been merely transferred to our language, by changing the Greek for Roman letters, and altering the termination. It must be supposed

that a proper word was used — one which exactly defines the nature of the ordinance. If the meaning of that word can be ascertained, all doubt ought to be removed. If, therefore, the word *baptizo*, in the Greek Testament, does not denote the word *immersion*, *dipping*, or *plunging*, in *distinction from other modes* of applying a liquid, then we acknowledge the foundation of our argument is not laid in solid rock, but on a shifting quick-sand. The main question, then, is, whether the word used by Christ, to enjoin baptism, in the last exercise of his legislation on earth, in giving that commission which is binding to "the end of the world," denotes a *specific* act or not. If it does not, then there is no *law* which certainly holds us to immersion, or defines what the act of the Saviour meant; whether it were the application of water to the head, or the feet, the face, or the hands.

The first argument, then which proves that baptism is *immersion* only, is drawn from the meaning of the word employed in the Scriptures to designate the rite. This we consider, as before remarked, the turning point in the controversy.

And here it must be evident, that the circumstances connected with the administration of the rite, the places chosen, such as Jordan and Enon, the force of the Greek prepositions *eis* and *ek*, which express a descent *into*, and a rising up *out* of, the water, as definitely as any prepositions in the Greek language can do it, are all strongly *corroborative* of our position, that the act of baptism, denoted by the term in Christ's commission, is properly and adequately translated into English by the word *immersion*, which comes from the Latin, or by the word *dipping*, of Anglo-Saxon origin. Were we not restricted by the rules adopted in the present discussion, we could adduce the Lexicons in great number, all of which give, as the primary meaning of the word, to dip, or to plunge, or to immerse.

Again: the figurative use of the word is another argument. A figure is used for illustration or emphasis; and in either case its force depends on the literal signification. There are several instances in the New Testament, where *baptizo* is used figuratively to denote *overwhelming*.

Thus, in Luke xii, 50: "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened until it be accomplished." That is, "I am about to be *overwhelmed* with sufferings, and I am greatly distressed with the prospect of them." A similar example is found in Mark x, 38, 39.

The word is used figuratively to signify *burial*, in Romans vi, 3, 4: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are *buried* with him by baptism into death." The same figure occurs in Colossians ii, 12: "Buried with him in baptism," &c.

It seems, gentlemen of the jury, too plain for argument, that baptism is here compared to a burial, in which the believer, being "dead to sin," is "buried" in baptism, and from this emblematic grave he rises again to a new and spiritual life. The figure is apt, beautiful, and impressive, if baptism is immersion; but it has no apparent pertinency if any thing else is baptism. When administered, therefore, by immersion, it is a monumental evidence of the great facts of man's redemption from sin, death, and

the grave, by the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. The believer's immersion in water, and emersion out of it, was a beautiful commemorative institution indicative of the burial and resurrection of the Messiah. "All the world comprehends this definition of *baptizo*. It has done more than a thousand volumes to break down the Papal institution of sprinkling, and lead men, first to Jesus, then to the water, and then to heaven." We believe, that, in the case of the Saviour, there was a *literal* burial and a *literal* resurrection; and that the initiatory rite of the Church, sets forth this glorious fact in a visible emblem. Believing, then, that the gist of the whole debate has, so far as language is concerned, turned upon the *proper*, *grammatical*, or *literal* meaning of *baptizo*, and having shown that baptism means immersion, and is the only valid baptism, we most benevolently, honestly, and conscientiously avow our conviction, that he who has not been immersed in water, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, has never received Christian baptism. All Baptists believe this.

For further illustration and confirmation of our views on this subject, we refer to the places selected for the administration of baptism. And the first we shall notice, are the accounts of the baptisms by John. It is useless, in this connection, to discuss the question, whether John's baptism is to be called Christian or not. The New Testament has but one *name* of the ordinance, by whomsoever administered, and the *act* must have been the same. John's baptism came "from heaven." Jesus received it, and the disciples had no other. If, as we have proved, baptism means immersion, then John immersed. The simple statements of baptism would probably convey to the minds of all men who should read the Bible for the first time, without any knowledge of the controversy on the subject, a right idea concerning baptism. We find John baptizing the people "in Jordan," Matthew iii, 5. "And then went out unto him all the land of Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan," Mark i, 15. "Jesus was baptized of John in Jordan," Mark v, 9. If

the idea that the preposition "*in*" might mean "*at*" were correct, the fact would still remain, that he repaired, for the purpose of baptizing, to the river Jordan, the average breadth of which, between the sea of Gallilee and the Dead Sea, is from sixty to eighty feet, and its depth about ten or twelve. Here the Saviour of mankind was baptized. A circumstance of thrilling interest to all who enter his kingdom. Most young Christians would naturally feel an interest in their Saviour's baptism, and would wish, if it were possible, to be baptized as he was. And as the record in the third of Matthew always suggests the idea of immersion, millions have hence believed that the Saviour was immersed. Special effort is therefore made — and doubtless will be made by my respondent — to neutralize the force of this example. The simple account of this transaction is all we deem necessary, at the present time, to lay before this intelligent jury. Matthew iii, 13: "Then cometh Jesus from Gallilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him." Matthew iii, 13: "And Jesus, when he was baptized,

went up straightway out of the water." Mark i. 9, 10: "And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Gallilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan. And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw heaven opened," &c. Here, gentlemen of the jury, with this simple, unvarnished account of the Saviour's baptism before you, I feel almost assured, that, were the case now submitted, you would, without hesitation, confirm the charge against the accused; and that, at this point, without going any further, John stands convicted — if a crime it be — of immersing Christ in the waters of Jordan, and all the region round about Jordan, who flocked to him for baptism.

Another fact confirmatory of John's practice of immersion, is, the reason expressly assigned for selecting a spot at Enon, near Salim — "*because there was much water there.*" Can there be any reasonable doubt, that John selected this spot because it was a convenient place for immersing the candidates? Is it a probable interpretation, that he chose the spot because the multitude needed many streams or rivulets,

as some contend, to supply themselves and their cattle with drink? The simple account of this case, must at once impress the unbiassed mind in favor of immersion.

Another passage which my present purpose leads me to examine, and which is strongly corroborative of those already adduced, and which is untrammelled by any Jewish incumbrance, being fully in accordance with the command of Christ, is in Acts viii, 36—39. It is the familiar case of Philip and the Ethiopian Eunuch, known and read of all men. On account of its brevity and simplicity, its ready access to common minds, which either from incapacity or want of opportunity for critical research, could not make the proper investigation, this passage has accomplished as much, if not more than any other, in convincing and confirming thousands, that the true and only baptism is by immersion. What can be plainer? "And they went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water," &c. If this simple account does not establish the

charge of this prosecution against Philip, for immersing the Ethiopian convert, then it would seem useless to proceed any further in this investigation in search of proofs and arguments to establish what appears already so plain.

Gentlemen of the Jury: The arguments by which we maintain our position, we have, as intended, presented in a very brief and compendious manner, without troubling you with critical remarks, which could be readily done by reference to other passages. And were we allowed a full citation of authorities, it could be established beyond doubt or denial, that the practice of the Christian world, for many centuries, affords important testimony. On this point there is overwhelming evidence. The best ecclesiastical historians, as, indeed, all the writers who have thoroughly investigated the subject, affirm, that the practice of the primitive Church was immersion. I know of no usage of ancient times which seems to be more clearly and certainly made out. I cannot see how it is possible for any candid man who examines the subject, to deny this.

Here the Judge interrupted the speaker, reminding him that he was departing from the rules of debate, that all evidence and matter without the Bible was excluded. He hoped the gentlemen would, for reasons already assigned, confine themselves closely to the course and order agreed upon.

Mr. SYMBOLICUS: I thank your honor, Judge; I knew the gentleman was out of order, and I would have arrested him at once, but I knew it was pretty certain to come from a higher authority; and would, therefore, be less offensive and more respected. But I must now claim it as my privilege, just at this point, to respond to the gentleman's closing remarks, while fresh in the minds of the jury; and if not met at the threshold, might leave an improper bias. (*The Judge permitting, Mr. Symbolicus proceeded.*)

My opponent, and all immersionists, take their stand on the practice of the ancient Churches. And it is notorious, that every little book they publish on the subject, and every harangue

from the pulpit, day and night, is more than half filled with garbled statements and disrupted sentences from ecclesiastical historians, Pedo-Baptist writers, Lexicographers, &c., &c. Now, what I maintain, and what, if they are fair and honest, they cannot refuse, is this, to carry out the testimony of ancient practice, which not only establishes the practice of infant baptism, but likewise the *fact* — the notorious FACT — that admits of no contradiction, that baptism in those days of immersion, was administered to men, women, and children, in a state of nudity — naked as Adam and Eve before the fall. The most tender, delicate, and modest females, old or young, could obtain no exception, where immersion must be practiced. The celebrated Baptist historian, ROBINSON, says, "The primitive Christians *baptized* NAKED. Nothing is easier than to give proof of this, by quotations from the authentic writings of the men who administered baptism, and who certainly knew in what way they themselves performed it. *There is no ancient historical fact better authenticated than this.*" It was pleaded and insisted

upon, because it was thought to be apostolic. At all events, it began very early in the Christian Church. Great care was taken to preserve the modesty of any woman that was to be baptized. "There were none but women came near, or in sight, till she was undressed, and her body in the water: then the priest came, and putting her head under, used the form of baptism. Then he departed, and the women took her out of the water, and clothed her again with white garments. But the preservation of modesty by this mode was impossible, especially when a number of women were to be baptized." In vain did the Churches seek to avoid the reproach of this scandalous practice, by building a separate baptistery for females, or by baptizing them separately. Priests, and priests only, in any common case, could administer the rite. The scandal of the thing still remained. It is said that Athenasius complained, that in his times there were "scandalous occurrences in the baptistery." To tell the story of the ancient mode of baptism, is enough to satisfy any one that his allegations must be well founded. The

scandal of the thing increased, as one might naturally suppose, to such a degree, that the Churches were at length forced into a proper sense of decency, and they burst asunder the bands of superstition.

I once for all re-affirm, that, revolting as the custom was, yet it is as certain as testimony can make it, all candidates for baptism, old men and women, young men and maidens, children and infants (for infant baptism they practiced as certainly as adult,) were completely divested of all their garments, in order to be baptized. But how it was possible that such a violation of decency could prevail, is a problem difficult of solution. Surely nothing but ignorance, or superstition, to make the very best of the case, could ever have adopted and continued such a shameful practice. Baptisteries, pools, and naked subjects, were unknown in the apostolic days. And so was immersion, dipping, plunging, as the form of a Christian rite, a palpable departure from the plain, simple, and instructive practice of gospel and apostolic baptism.

All I contend for, just at this stage of the controversy, is, *consistency* in my opponent. Let him not introduce the historic chain of testimony, then break it right in two, take as much as suits him, throw the rest away, and then, with that portion retained, and in estimation strong as holy writ, endeavor to fortify his position, as all immersionists do, and then raise the shout of victory and triumph. No, let him go the whole chain, baptisteries, immersions, nakedness, and all, as was the ancient practice of which he boasts so much — or reject the whole, as the Church at the reformation did, when she came to her proper senses. I beg your Honor's pardon for this digression from the course I had expected. Is it in order for me to proceed? Is the gentleman for the prosecution through with his argument?

Mr. WATERMAN: For the present, I shall defer any further remarks, until near the close of the trial, as then it will be my privilege, if I should deem it expedient to do so.

Mr. SYMBOLICUS: Then may it please your Honor, and you, gentlemen of the Jury; in presenting my argument on the subject, I shall follow, somewhat, in the course the gentleman for the prosecution has adopted; who admits, that the turning point in this controversy is the meaning of the Greek word *baptizo*, which has been merely transferred to our language, by changing the Greek for Roman letters, and altering the termination. This is fact. So when the Bible came to be translated into Latin, this word *baptizo* was simply *transferred*, not *translated*. Now, as there were words in the Latin which signified *immerse* and *submerge*, why did not the learned men of the third and fourth centuries, when they made the Latin Vulgate, and at the time, too, when the practice of immersion so much prevailed, employ *immergo* or *submergo*, instead of the Greek word *baptizo*, which they transferred into their Latin Bible, as the English have done in theirs? Most assuredly, if they held the same views of our Baptist friends of the present day, they would, without a moment's hesitation, have translated

baptizo by *immergo*. But so they did not. How can this be accounted for? Just because they knew *baptizo* was the only word in existence, excepting *purify*, which had been commonly used to denote the Christian sacrament of *baptism*. Their Latin words which signified *immerse*, and *submerge*, did not properly define the ordinance. Immersion, as a mode, did not express the meaning of baptism. It is a bad *Latin* term, and is a very convenient cover for a very delusive proposition. It is a word notoriously uncertain in its application and import. Many things that were immersed, were not baptized. One is immersed who stands on his feet up to his knees or his waist, or his neck, in water; he also is immersed, Baptists say, and as my opponent has also maintained to-day, in the figurative sense of *overwhelming*, or over whose head the water flows. No wonder such a term as this, so indeterminate, unlimited, unfixed, was intentionally excluded by the early and learned translators of the Latin. This is a fact — a sledge-hammer fact — which carries dismay

and ruin in the camp of modern Baptist translators of the Bible. When the Bible — our good old anti-sectarian Bible — was translated into English, the word baptize was, for the same reason, no doubt, simply transferred. It was not an English word, nor a Hebrew word, nor a Latin word. "But in the Greek of the New Testament, and in the Latin translation of the Bible, it had been long appropriated as the *name* of the Christian sacrament referred to. The transfer of this word *baptism* into the English Bible, was only calling the thing by its right name. It had no other name in any language; and this name having been adopted, and used in all religious writings to denote that peculiar thing called baptism, has become naturalized as its name in our language. It means the Christian sacrament of *baptism*, and nothing else. And we have no other word in the language which expresses this meaning." So says Dr. Peters.

But my opponent asserts very positively, without proof, that baptism means *immersion*, and nothing else. Well, what does immersion

mean? Is it any thing more than a *mode*, or external form of baptism? But the outward shadow, or mode of external baptism, as we shall show more fully by and by, is not baptism. It is the *thing itself*, and not the *form*, that must be received into the mind. To say that baptism is immersion, and immersion is baptism, is going round in a circle without point; and then, being exhausted, sit down in the middle in mere shadow and sound.

What, then, is the simple, intelligent, Scriptural idea of the word *baptizo?* Does it mean to *dip*, to *plunge*, to *immerse?* No. Does it mean to *pour?* No. Does it mean to *sprinkle?* No. It does not mean *mode* of any kind. It means the *thing*, whatever it is, and not the *form*. It is true, the Apostle Paul, in Hebrews vi, 2, speaks of the "*doctrine of baptisms*," in the plural, thereby denoting that there are two kinds of baptism; the one internal and spiritual, performed by the Holy Spirit in the "*washing of regeneration;*" the other is external, performed by men "*with water*," denoting a ritual purifying by some

manner of application of water, which is called "*the* WASHING *of water.*" In receiving the Scriptural idea of baptism, then, we must refer to the *intent*, the "*doctrine*," and the *effect*, omitting all reference to the *mode* — having in the mind a definition which shall express the *substance*, the *doctrine* of baptism, with no reference to mode. I wish the particular attention of the jury to this point, on which, as admitted, the whole controversy turns. That we have given the true, Scriptural import of the word *baptize*, we shall expect to establish in the further progress of this discussion, beyond all successful contradiction.

The question, then, gentlemen of the Jury, and the one which brings us to the real and only issue, is this: Is the command of our Saviour, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them," &c., an *open* command or not? Is it a command to *purify*, or to *baptize* without reference to mode, or is it a command to perform an external *specific* act? My opponent maintains the latter. And so do all Baptists. With them, to baptize, is

to dip, plunge, or immerse; and therefore when Christ gave command to his disciples to go and baptize, it was the same as go and immerse. But where, in all the acts of his legislation, has he given such a command — a *specific* command — as to the *mode* of baptism? Show it to us, and we will all obey. But we may call for proof till doom's-day, without any response but naked, proofless assertion, which is "proof only for fools." Again, we repeat it, if the command to baptize be specific, designating the mode, then let us all obey without hesitation. But if the command be *open* — a command to purify, without reference to mode, but by the outward use of water, which shall *signify an external, ritual purifying*, by some manner of application of water, which is called "*the* WASHING *of water;*" then let us all cease to dispute about forms, and obey in that mode which seems to us most significant, decorous, and solemn. If there be any ground on which the whole evangelical Church could meet in harmony, here it is. To effect such a desirable result, two fundamental requisites

are here combined. No Church would be deprived of any thing which it desires, as to its own mode of purification; and it would authorize each Church to regard the purification, though differing from its own, as valid.

This sentiment deserves special notice, and may be expanded and illustrated after the following manner: The *essence* and the *form* of a thing are quite different. A man and his shadow are not the same; the latter follows him in the day time, but disappears in the night, yet the man is the same. He changes not. Or thus: Six men have a pound of gold each, but all in different forms — one is square, another triangle, a third round, a fourth diamond, a fifth hexagon, and the sixth octagon — all of equal value, and each would meet with equal favor at bank. Now, how supremely ridiculous and contemptibly puerile, to find them all quarreling and disputing about the *mode*, or the form of each other's lump of gold! Mr. *Square* says to his neighbor, *Triangle*, "You've got no gold at all, because it is not in the shape of mine." And Mr. *Triangle*

retorts in the same words — and so of all the rest. But should you be looking among all these lumps for a symbol of the sun, his golden beams and globular form, then you, without hesitation, apply to Mr. *Ball.*

But this open command we deem of so much importance, and which we wish fairly understood — if not already made fully sensible — may be accomplished by the following exemplication, showing the difference between an *open* and a *specific* command.

I have important business to transact at Washington city. I cannot attend to it myself, personally. I have a trusty servant, or agent, to whom I issue my command. It is, that he go to Washington and transact this business for me. Here the command — go to Washington — is specific. But the *mode* of traveling, or *how* he is to go there, I have not specified. I have left it with himself to go as he prefers — by stage, by steamboat, by railroad, horse-back, or on foot. But if I say to him, you must take my horse and buggy, as the method of conveyance, then my command would not only

be specific as to the thing to be done, but likewise as to the mode or manner of performance. Now, where has our Master issued such a command? Where has he specified the *manner* of external, ritual purification? Let the plain, unequivocal enactment, or command, be produced. But we ask in vain.

For further illustration, I barely mention a case of a parallel nature, and of equal importance; I mean the Lord's Supper. The command is as follows: "THIS DO *in remembrance of me*." All the circumstances of the occasion are familiar — the time, place, position of the guests, &c. Why do not our Baptist friends, upon their own principles, plead for the celebration of this ordinance by night, and this, too, in an upper chamber, in a reclining posture, &c., &c.? How do they obey this command of Jesus, according to the tenor of their own exegesis, while they do not literally imitate him in all these particulars? Where is their consistency? But as the believer really obeys this command in the sitting, standing, or kneeling posture, the *mode* not being essential,

so in regard to outward baptism, it is not the *mode*, but the *thing itself*, as the object, that constitutes acceptable obedience.

Let us, then, before we go to Jordan, or to Enon, to ascertain the mode of John's baptism, first settle the point on which, as the gentleman admits, this controversy turns. This we shall do, according to our plan of arrangement, not by hunting up Lexicographers, Commentators, Greek Classics, &c. &c., but by examining the *facts* and circumstances of the cases to which we shall refer. What, then, we repeat, is the simple, Scriptural idea of the word *baptize?* Does it mean to *immerse?* No. Does it mean to *pour?* No. Does it mean to *sprinkle?* No. It does not mean *mode* of any kind. It means the *thing*, whatever it is, and not the *form*. And here, Gentlemen of the Jury, in directing your attention to the Scriptural idea of baptism, as before reminded, you must have special regard to the *intent* and the *effect*, and omit all reference to the *mode*. Fasten, then, your minds on the *substance*, not on the *shadow*. We expect to establish the following

proposition, or definition, beyond the possibility of successful denial: —

"*That baptize, in a generic and peculiar New Testament use of the word, primarily denotes an external, ritual purifying, by some manner of application of water, which is called "the* WASHING *of water;" and secondly, it denotes an inward purifying by the Holy Ghost, called "the* WASHING *of regeneration.*" Ephesians v, 26; Titus iii, 5.

As we read of two kinds of circumcision under the legal dispensation, that "which is *outward* in the flesh," and "that of the *heart* in the spirit," so are there, under the gospel dispensation, two kinds of baptism, the *external*, performed by men "*with water*," the other *internal* and *spiritual*, performed by the Holy Ghost — "John truly baptized *with water*; but ye shall be baptized *with the Holy Ghost.*" Acts i, 5. In view of this definition, how simple and natural the statement! "John truly *purified with water;* but ye shall be *purified* with (or by) the Holy Ghost." Mark here the contrast. It exists in three particulars

— the subject, the agent, and the means. In the one case, the subject was a human body; in the other, a human spirit. In the one case, the agent was material, or physical, *i. e.* a man; in the other, the agent was the Holy Spirit. In the case of John, the means were water — in the case of the Holy Spirit, his own internal spiritual emotions. From this and other passages of Scripture, it is plain that they represent the baptism of the Spirit, and the baptism with water, as analagous. The one is the outward sign or emblem of the other. In the baptism of the Holy Spirit, the subject, the agent, the means, and the effect, demand the idea to *purify*, and exclude the idea to immerse; for the subject is the spirit of man, the agent the Divine Spirit, the means spiritual, and the effect purity; and in such relations, the idea to immerse is absurd; purify being the only reasonable sense.

In further confirmation of this great truth, we have the amplest warrant, and most unequivocal example, in the word of God. In John iii, 22 — 26, we learn that while Jesus, with his disciples, was baptizing in Judea, and John in Enon, a question arose between some of John's disciples

and the Jews, about PURIFYING. To settle it, they come and refer it to John under the shape of a question about BAPTIZING. Their minds fastened on the substance — the thing itself — not on the circumstance. Baptism, with them, was not an *immersing*, or any other external mode, but a *purifying*. Their question is about baptizing; but it is not about dipping, or sprinkling, or pouring, or immersing — none of these — but about PURIFYING; and they state the question to John, as a question about *baptizing*. In their view, the words baptize and purify are so far synonymous, that in a debate about purifying they may use either the word purify or the word baptize. The following translation of the passage, we are assured, will present the true sense and the argument at once to the eye.

"After these things, came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea, and there he tarried with them, and *purified*. And John was *purifying* in Enon, near Salim, because there was much water there; and they came to him and were *purified*. THEREFORE, there arose a question concerning *purification* between some of the

disciples of John and the Jews, and they came unto John and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bearest witness, behold the same *purifieth*, and all men come to him." Here by the concurrence of two claims to baptize, there would seem to be a rivalry between the claims of the two, as if Christ was improperly drawing men away from John's purification. In reply to all this, John clearly avowed the superiority of Christ to himself, and justified his course. In all this, one thing must be certain; with them the word purify could not be synonimous with immerse; for their common purifications of persons were either in the general mode of *washing*, or in the particular mode of *sprinkling* — never necessarily in the mode of immersing.

1 Cor. xii, 13, is another passage where the baptism of the Holy Spirit is expressly taught. "For by ONE SPIRIT we are all BAPTIZED into ONE BODY, and have all been made to drink into one spirit." Here the Holy Spirit is directly said to baptize — not *immerse;* this would falsify the word of God. For in this case all external

acts are excluded — entirely out of the question; and purify is the only appropriate sense. In all the context of this passage, the Spirit is represented as an active, intelligent divine person, by whom wisdom, faith, and spiritual gifts are given; and *en* and *dia* are interchanged as equivalent. To one is given (*dia*) *by* the Spirit, the word of wisdom; to another, gifts of healing by (*en*) the same Spirit. All these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every man, severally, as he will. After this comes the assertion, "By one Spirit we have all been baptized into one body" — that is, of necessity, purified, and thus united in one spiritual body; not immersed, or plunged, or dipped, into one body. The Spirit never immerses externally, and internal immersion or dipping is here out of the question. How forced and unnatural to say, by one Spirit are we all *immersed*, plunged, or dipped, into one body! Immersion into a body is absurd. It will not do to say, that admitting to the Church by the external rite is here meant, because that is never performed by the Spirit, but by man. But the baptism here

spoken of, is as much an internal work of the Holy Spirit, as the causing to drink into one Spirit, which is not external, but an internal and real work of the Spirit. To the true believer there is given "living water;" yea, there "shall be *in him* a well of water springing up into everlasting life." To immerse in water is not the work of the Spirit, nor is it his work to immerse the mind; but to purify the mind is. But if immersion were meant, in the passage before us, then something would follow into which the mind could be immersed, as spiritual water, or something equally absurd. The Holy Spirit illuminates and purifies. Immersion, as such, does neither. It signifies mode, and nothing else; and it can pollute as well as purify. Job ix, 31. If we simply say, that the Holy Spirit purifies, it exactly describes his real work. But if we say he immerses, and omit all mention of that into which he immerses, it conveys no definite idea of any effect on the mind. And, furthermore, so long as it is true that the Holy Spirit, as A PERSON, baptizes, it is absurd to speak of being immersed into him. Immersed into *a*

Person! — the third *Person* in the *Godhead!* In the name of sober reason and common sense, what similitude is there between the operations of the Holy Spirit and immersion? None — none whatever. For these reasons we deny the propriety of applying immersion to the Holy Spirit and claim the sense to purify, for this is his glorious, his grand and peculiar work. *Beecher*, p. 313.

We adduce another indubitable proof to sustain our proposition. It is in Acts xxii, 16; and contains the words of Ananias to Paul before he was baptized. They are these, "*Arise*"— literally, *stand up*, or *standing again*, (anastas) *baptisai*, *baptize thyself*, (middle voice,) that is, receive baptism, *kai apolousai*, "*and* WASH AWAY thy sins." Here, gentlemen of the jury, I want your special attention. The two words, *baptisai* and *apolousai*, are used as equivalent to each other; and the natural conclusion would seem to be, that *washing*, or *washing off*, was the manner of the baptism on this occasion. This will be made to appear more fully, when we come to the case of Paul's baptism, separately, as to the mode. Our only remark, further, on this passage,

is this: As it is not the water, but the blood of Christ which cleanseth, or washes away our sins, why did Ananias tell Paul to receive baptism, and *wash away* his sins? There is no difficulty here — nothing like baptismal regeneration, as some believe, in the text. By one of the most common figures in rhetoric, the *sign* and the *thing signified*, are conversely and indifferently used in ordinary forms of speech. Here is one at hand, just to fit the case before us: David, when he prays, "Purge me with *hyssop* and I shall *be clean*," figuratively ascribes to the *sign* what evidently belonged to the thing signified. So this is doubtless the meaning of Ananias to Saul: "Arise" — stand up — and be baptized, in testimony of your faith in Christ, and as a sign, or token, of being cleansed from the guilt and defilement of your sins, by the pardoning grace of God, and the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit.

Another proof of the same character, to sustain our proposition, is 1 Peter iii, 20, 21. The Apostle there tells us, that "in the days of Noah eight souls were saved in the ark by

water. The like figure whereunto baptism doth also now save us." Stop there. What baptism is that which saves us? Does immersion, or sprinkling, or pouring, save any body? To attribute to the mere *water* a cleansing or saving potency, were a vain superstition, against which Peter carefully and expressly warns us. He has not left the word *baptisma*, baptism, unguarded. He does not mean the external purification of the body in any mode. He guards himself, and says, I do not mean the *outward* baptism, which I call "the putting away the filth of the flesh;" but I mean the internal purification of the mind, which I call "the answer of a good conscience towards God;" the same that Paul describes, "having our *hearts sprinkled* from an evil conscience." And this is "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ"— that is, the resurrection of Christ being the *basis* both of Christian hope and sincere baptismal confession. But what of "the *like figure* whereunto even baptism doth also now save us?" How was that baptism, as a means of salvation prefigured? Surely not by the *waters*, but by the salvation of those in the ark, who

"were saved by water." But how were they saved by water? Let Dr. CARSON, the great Baptist champion, answer. He says: "Noah and his family were saved by being buried in the water of the flood: and after the flood they emerged as rising from the grave." Is it possible, you will say, that any sensible man can adopt such a miserable conceit as this! It is not true, in fact, that Noah and his family were ever "buried in the waters," nor that they emerged from them. Certainly they were not saved by submersion. This was the very evil from which the ark was the instrument of their deliverance. All the wicked outside the ark, were buried in the waters of the flood. Submersion was as fatal to them, as it was to the Egyptians, who were submerged in the Red Sea. The idea that the ark, and they that were in it were immersed in the flood is absurd. They were borne aloft on the surface of the water, and the ark was *sprinkled* with the rain that fell from heaven in great profusion. Is not this "the figure whereunto" Peter likens Christian baptism? It was a *sprinkling with water*, and the very idea

of immersion is excluded. Those in the ark were saved by purification, those out of it were destroyed by immersion. Does not the immersionist in this passage, miss a "*figure?*"

Gentlemen of the Jury, you must be patient. We have "a few more left of the same sort," by which we expect to establish our position beyond the possibility of a failure. Let it not be forgotten that we define baptism, as a "washing" in the sense of "purifying;" *a ritual purifying by some manner of application of water, as emblematic of the internal spiritual purification of the Holy Spirit.* The following case we consider in point.

Acts x, 47, Peter says, in respect to Cornelius and those with him, who believed on Christ: "Can any man *forbid water* that these should not be baptized?" What reason does Peter assign for this baptism? Does he say, because Christ was baptized? Or that he was buried either in Jordan or in the sepulchre? Not a hint of it. It is stated, "the Holy Ghost fell on all them that heard the word." It appears that they were all converted, — all baptized by the

Holy Spirit. And therefore the plain, simple, intelligent, reason for their baptism, was because they "have *received the Holy Ghost.*" And now, as *emblematic* of that important fact, let us have some water — will some one be kind enough to have some brought in, that these may be baptized? The language used on the occasion implies that the baptism was performed on the spot, and that by the application of water to the persons, and not the persons to the water. There is no intimation — not the slightest — of their withdrawing from the house, or going out of it. There was no outward parade — no going down into the water—no "liquid grave" — no "watery tomb" — no change of raiment — no baptistery resorted to in the house, or bathing instrument brought in, — no, nothing of all these modern inventions of men. But all is easy, simple, convenient. "Can any one forbid water, that these should not be baptized?"

Gentlemen of the Jury: In all the immersions you ever saw or heard of, was any Baptist minister ever heard to say, when going to baptize his converts, "Can any one forbid the river, the lake,

the pond, that these should not be *immersed?*" Private wells, springs, and reservoirs, may be withheld from public use as private property. But who ever heard, or dreamed of Jordan, the Ohio, the Delaware, or any other river, or stream, running freely, and unrestricted in an open country being prohibited, or denied for yourself, or your stock, much less for the sacred use of a baptismal service? Immersion in this case is all guess work, and lame at that. I therefore repeat it with assurance that the intimation seems to be, the converts on this occasion were baptized on the spot, and that water was to be brought in for the purpose. And we are persuaded, that the more easy and natural interpretation is such as we have now given.

As we proceed, let it be kept firmly in mind, that there are two distinct kinds of purification, that of the Spirit, and that of water;—one real, internal, and effectual, the other only a symbol, an external rite, and yet both are called by the same name, purification, or baptism. The word *baptizo* is used in connection with both kinds of purification, legal and moral, of the conscience

and of the heart. By giving it a meaning so extensive as purify, it is adapted to fulfill all its relations. But confining it to a meaning so limited as to immerse, it is unfitted for at least one half the relations in which it stands.

In confirmation of this distinction, we refer to John iii, 5: "Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." It is maintained from these words, by those who hold to baptismal regeneration, "that *a birth from water* is immediately associated with *a birth from the Spirit;* that a birth from both one and the other is represented as being a necessary qualification for the kingdom of heaven; and that an inseparable union of the two may be thence plainly inferred." But this does not follow from the text. The figure, "born of water," has reference to external baptism. It is to be baptized, as *emblematic* of purification. And to "*enter*," legally and visibly, as a member of the terrestrial, professional, or temporal kingdom of grace, a man must be ritually, professionally, or externally purified by baptismal water. Thus, a man may "*enter*"

into the Church visible, and be recognized as a legal and visible member of the Church — as thousands have been — and yet not be *born of the Spirit.* In this sense it is understood by those who practice it, how infants, baptized, *enter* the kingdom of God, as members, in an inferior sense. But to enter into the celestial, ultimate, or eternal kingdom of glory, he must be internally, or actually sanctified, regenerated by the Holy Spirit. In verse 3, "Except a man be born again, he cannot *see;*" that is, enjoy "the kingdom of God." The pure in heart shall *see* — enjoy the kingdom of God. But in the text he may *enter* the Church, legally and professionally, without regeneration. By the phrase, therefore, "born of water," we understand, that, in a *figurative* sense, we are brought into a new state of things — into a new state of *relative* existence to Christ and his Church, new privileges and obligations, new associations and service. To infer from this text that the external rite of baptism introduces the subject into *a spiritual* and *saving* relation, is to adopt the old error of the Jews respecting circumcision.

In further tracing this important subject, we begin with the prediction of John, in Matthew iii, 11. And that we may have the subject fairly before us, we shall use A. CAMPBELL'S new version itself. "I indeed *immerse* you in water. . . . He (Christ) will *immerse* you in the Holy Spirit and in fire." Now for the history of the fulfillment of this prophetic declaration. This we shall find, not only as to the *fact* that Christ did indeed baptize his disciples with the Holy Spirit, but also as to the *mode* of its performance.

In Acts i, 5, we learn that the event predicted is just at hand. "For indeed John *immersed* in water, but ye shall be immersed *in* the Holy Spirit within these few days." *Immersed in the Holy Spirit! Immersed in fire!* How harsh, forced, unnatural! That the Messiah should immerse is no where foretold; but that he should *purify*, is often and fully predicted. (Malachia iii, 1–3.) In Matthew iii, 11, it reads, *I baptize you en udati*, WITH *water*, or BY *water*. Here is the dative (*udati*) with the preposition (*en.*) In Mark i, 8, and John i, 26

31, 33, the same. In Luke iii, 16; Acts i, 5, 11, 16, we have the dative merely — the idiom being peculiar to Luke. Now let the preposition *en* be rendered BY, as it is in 1 Corinthians xii, 13, "*By* one Spirit we have all been baptized into one body." "To one is given . . . . gifts of healing by (*en*) the same Spirit;" and very plainly a *person*, and active agent, is denoted: thus, he shall *baptize;* that is, *purify* you BY the Holy Spirit. The Holy Ghost, as a *person*, does not immerse, he purifies.

Let us proceed in our investigation. We take the immersionist on his own ground — we follow his own translation. "And when the day of Pentecost was completely arrived, they were all, with unanimous affection, in the same place." Now for the fulfillment — the *immersion in* the Holy Ghost and *in* fire! "And on a sudden there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing violent wind; and it (the sound) filled all the house where they were sitting. And there appeared to them separated tongues, as of fire; and it rested upon each of them. And they were filled with the Holy Spirit." Do you

inquire now, *how* were the disciples *immersed in* the Holy Spirit? This *New Version* (A. Campbell's) says the Holy Spirit "*rested upon* each of them"—"where they were SITTING!" While sitting in an erect posture, they were *immersed in* the Holy Spirit!! But let us complete our research.

The effect produced drew the following declaration from Peter on the occasion: "This Jesus hath God raised, ... and having received the promise from the Father, he has SHED FORTH this, which ye now see and hear." Here is the *mode* of the Spirit's baptism—"*shed forth*"—according to this famous translation itself, which we quote on this subject, exclusively. Let us trace it a little further. "While Peter was speaking these words (Acts x, 44) the Holy Spirit FELL UPON all that were hearing the word; and they of the circumcision . . . . were astonished, that the gift of the Holy Spirit was POURED OUT upon the Gentiles also." Peter, in a subsequent address, at Jerusalem, vindicating his conduct in the case of Cornelius, "opened to them the matter in order," and relates the fact

thus: "And as I began to speak, the Holy Spirit FELL UPON them, even as UPON US AT THE BEGINNING"— *i. e.*, on Pentecost.—"And I remembered the word of the Lord, how, he said, (Acts i, 5,) John indeed immersed *in* water; but you shall be immersed *in* the Holy Spirit."

Now, Gentlemen of the Jury, summon all your acumen and all your candor here; and being divested of partiality and all prejudice against, or prepossession in favor of any religious sect or denomination whatever, independently declare your judgment respecting the Holy Spirit's baptism. Was it by *immersion?* as this new translation declares, or was it, (in the "modernized" style of the same book,) "*shed forth*"—"*poured out*," and "*fell upon*"—"*rested upon*" each of the disciples *in an erect posture*, in "the house where they were SITTING." It is a fact, that none of the disciples of Christ, mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, ever received the Holy Ghost but by *effusion*. But if baptism necessarily and exclusively means immersion, and John baptized by immersion, then it cannot be true that Jesus did *baptize* his disciples with or by the Holy

Spirit. Here then is the dilemma: allow the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and of fire, was a descent UPON, and not an immersion, or a plunging INTO, and, therefore, is not in this passage used for immersion; or deny that Jesus ever did *baptize* with the Holy Spirit.

I wish it to be particularly noted, that they on whom the *Spirit was poured out*, are explicitly affirmed to have been *baptized with the Spirit*. There is no getting over this. The *baptisma*, *baptism*, is effected by the *ekhusis*, *effusion*, and not by *immersion*. There is no intimation of immersion in the whole connection. It will never be affirmed that the verb *ekhuo*, I *pour out*, *shed*, &c., signifies to *immerse;* and yet the apostle Peter declares *ekhusis* to have been the accomplishment of the promise, *baptisthesesthe*, *ye shall be baptized* with the Holy Ghost, Acts i, 5. How the promised baptism of the Holy Ghost is accomplished may be seen in chapter ii, 33 — he hath *shed forth*, (*exehee*,) this which ye now see and hear." So likewise in chapter x, 45 — "On the Gentiles was *poured out* (*ekkehutai*,) the gift of the Holy Ghost;" compare chapter xi, 15, 16

So in Titus iii, 6, the Holy Spirit's baptism, or "*washing of renegeration* which he (*exeheen*) *shed on* us abundantly," is very plainly indicated not by immersion, but by *effusion*.

I consider this proof and argument both valid and conclusive, and so some immersionists of no small acquirements have felt it. They could find no way of getting round it, except in the indulgence of an excursive imagination, they have invented something like a *vapor-bath* where the disciples "were sitting," and reduced the Holy Spirit's influences to something like a material fluid, by which they were enveloped, and in a proper sense *immersed* in the Holy Ghost. Did ever fancy "at the noon of night, playing at will, frame in the madman's brain" such a monstrous phantasy — such a moon-struck reverie as this! When shall our world be rid of such metaphysical absurdity, such indecency, if not blasphemy, of attributing place and extension, of tangibility and materiality in this manner, to the Divine Spirit, who is at all times invisible, intangible, and immaterial. It is truly amazing to see what vain imaginations, what unwarrantable license for the

sake of a favorite dogma, men will take at the expense of reason, truth, and common sense. Just think of the Holy Spirit's influences reduced to a material fluid, filling a room full of vapor, and then listen at these modern mechanicians — these inventors of a monstrous phantasy. *Immersed in* the Holy Spirit — immersed *in fire!* O tell it not in Christendom, publish it not in the nineteenth century, lest Zion hide her face for shame, and infidelity triumph!

I wish now, Gentlemen of the Jury, to introduce three important witnesses, the agreement of whose testimony will go far to strengthen our position. They are found in 1 John v, 8, "There are three that bear witness in earth, the SPIRIT and the WATER, and the BLOOD; and these three agree in ONE." Now, "if we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater." In the law of evidence, it is a settled principle, that two or three competent or credible witnesses are fully sufficient to prove any matter of fact. Agreement among witnesses gives great weight to testimony, while the reverse induces suspicion, weakens confidence, and sometimes destroys credibility. It

is not thus with God's three witnesses in earth; they are in perfect harmony. They agree in one — in man's *internal* PURIFICATION. Man can be saved only through an atonement — "*by the* WASHING OF REGENERATION." This was the grand object of Christ's coming, that he might "save his people *from their sins*," by creating in, or imparting to, them "a clean heart" and a pure spirit. Keep this grand object in view — the removal of man's moral defilement by spiritual purification. "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part in me."

The first witness is the "Spirit," the efficient agent in purification. Let us hear his testimony; Acts xv, 8, 9, "And God, who knoweth the hearts, bear them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, PURIFYING *their hearts* by faith." 2 Thess. ii, 13, "God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation, through SANCTIFICATION of the SPIRIT." 1 Peter i, 2, "Elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, through SANCTIFICATION of the SPIRIT." Enough; let us have, by a little change in the order of the text, the second witness — "the BLOOD." The

blood of Christ is the *meritorious*, the *procuring* cause of internal purification. Here is the testimony: 1 John i, 7, "the *blood* of Jesus Christ CLEANSETH us from all sin." Heb. ix, 14, "How much more shall the *blood* of Christ PURGE your conscience from dead works." This testimony, so explicit, may suffice.

Having found two of the witnesses in such exact harmony, let us examine the testimony of the third — "the WATER." Water is a common fluid, one of the most cleansing, fertilizing, powerful agents in nature. Here is the case before us. Ephesians v, 25, 26, "Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might *sanctify* and *cleanse* it with the WASHING OF WATER." 1 Cor. vi, 11, "But ye are WASHED, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." Paul here uses three words, *washed*, *sanctified*, *justified*, to denote the various agencies of the Holy Spirit by which the Corinthians had been recovered from sin. Washing is an emblem of purifying. That work of the Spirit by which the process of purifying was *commenced* in

the soul, and which was especially signified in baptism: Hebrews x, 22, "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies *washed* with pure water;" John iii, 5, "Born of *water* and of the Spirit,"—the water, the significant symbol of the Holy Spirit's internal purification. So in Ezekiel xxxvi, 25, "I will sprinkle *clean water* upon you and ye shall be *clean;*—a new heart will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you." Here is the great work of purification adumbrated by the outward sprinkling of "*clean water.*"

Once more, and the evidence is complete. Numbers viii, 6, 7, "Take the Levites . . and *cleanse* them—and thus shalt thou do to cleanse them—*sprinkle water* of PURIFYING upon them." Here, Gentlemen of the Jury, you see how harmoniously God's three witnesses in earth agree in the one great FACT—the moral *purification* of fallen man's corrupt and sinful nature. But mark ye well; what a discrepancy there is on the Baptists' plan of immersion—of going down to Jordan, or to any other river, in search of Christ's "liquid grave," or his "emblematic grave," his "mystic

grave," his "sacramental grave," or his rocky grave, at Jerusalem, in the sepulchre, and all such poetic fancies, and false notions — I say, just make immersion, or submersion in water, refer to a *burial* in any sense, and see what havoc you make of the testimony of the three witnesses! You make the water testify quite a different thing altogether from the Spirit and the blood. And on Baptist principles they never can be made to agree. And here I aver, the difference between us and our Baptist friends, right at this point, is more serious, radical, and fundamental, than many are aware of. We make external baptism, the symbol of the Holy Spirit's "washing of regeneration," they make it the emblem of *death* and the *grave;* judge ye, then, who honors God's three witnesses in earth, by harmonizing their testimony — we, or our opponents.

Again: Gentlemen of the Jury, before we go to Jordan, let us do as the prophet was commanded, "Make a chain," Ezekiel vii, 23. Or rather let us exhibit one already made to hand by the apostle Paul. It is very precious — more precious than "the merchandize of silver," "than

fine gold," "yea, more precious than rubies." It consists of *seven* links, and may be seen in Ephesians iv, 4, 6. "There is one body — one Spirit — one hope — one Lord — one faith — one baptism, one God and Father of all." We will examine this chain, link by link, to see if we can ascertain its homogeneous character. If the links are not all of the same character, then it is not homogeneous, and consequently there must be a break in the chain. The first two, we shall take together. "There is *one body* and *one Spirit;*" *i. e.* the *body* of Christ — the Church, and the Holy Spirit, from whom she receives her spiritual vitality. The same as taught by Paul in 1 Cor. xii, 13: "By *one Spirit* are we all baptized into *one body.*" The third link is "*One hope;*" to the body, the Church, there never belonged but one hope, as to its foundation, its nature, and object, and that is, "the hope of salvation," 1 Thess. v, 8: the "good hope through grace," 2 Thess. ii, 16: "The hope set before us, which hope we have as an anchor of the soul, Heb. vi, 18, 19. "*One Lord,*" *i. e.* "One Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are

all things," 1 Cor. viii, 6. Here is the fourth link, and a precious one indeed it is: "To you that believe, he is precious." The fifth link is "*One faith*," both objectively and subjectively. Christians believe in the same doctrines, or have faith of the same nature in the heart. They have but one faith, a common faith, in regard to its object, its nature, and foundation. They look unto Jesus the Author and Finisher of their faith, and in whom they believe to the saving of the soul, Hebrews x, 39. We come now to the sixth link in this wondrous chain: "*One baptism*." And here we must pause and examine carefully, and minutely. If we can ascertain the true character of this link, about which there is much dispute, or difference of opinion, it will go far, if not entirely settle the whole matter. And for this purpose we have intentionally made this connective exhibition. The question will be, does this link possess the same intrinsic quality in common with the rest, or does it not? Does it mean the external baptism — as Baptists render it — "*One immersion?*" or does it mean the baptism of the "*One Spirit?*" If the Baptists'

interpretation is admitted, then is there a break in the chain — it is broken and destroyed A link is inserted of an essentially different quality from all the rest, which — including the seventh, "one God and Father of all" — are of pure gold. This Baptist link is, comparatively, of a *leaden* character. Or plainer still, by way of illustration, you, Gentlemen of the Jury, are, most of you, if not all, farmers. A link is broken out from your trace chain; not having time to go a distance, perhaps, to a smith-shop, you insert a strong leather thong, which is to do for the present. But is not the uniform character of the chain lost? And so — I speak comparativly — is *immersion* no better in the gospel chain before us, than your leather link in your trace chain. But you will ask me: can a homogeneous character — a character having the same nature, and qualities be ascertained in the chain under consideration? Most certainly. Consider now; was there ever one of Adam's fallen race saved without "*the washing of regeneration*, and renewing of the Holy Ghost?" Most assuredly not. Well, does not every soul thus saved, immediately belong to

the "body of Christ?" Certainly. Now admit that Adam and Eve were saved; then the "one body of Christ — the Church real, internal and spiritual, included Adam and Eve, Abel, Enoch, Noah, Moses, Job, David, &c., &c., all being saved by the "ONE BAPTISM," "the WASHING of regeneration." "BY ONE SPIRIT, all BAPTIZED into ONE BODY," whether Jews or Gentiles, bond or free, anti-diluvians or post-diluvians, the "one body," like the human body, never existed one moment, without the "one Spirit" — the Holy Spirit. Here is a baptism, then, "that doth now save us;" *a baptism that must have existed contemporary with the first human soul baptized by one Spirit* — hundreds of years before external baptism, in any mode or form was known. It is the one baptism — the one internal purification, from the commencement, to the consummation or completion of the one body of Christ. We therefore, without fear of successful denial, or refutation, hold up this glorious chain of seven gold links, in its beautiful, homogeneous, harmonious character. And that it may not be thought that, by this enlarged view of the

subject, we thereby depreciate the external rite, we maintain that the baptism of all that belong to the Church of Christ, is but *one* in its nature, tendency, and design, whether we consider it as the *internal* baptism of the Holy Ghost, by which they are renewed and sanctified; or as the *external* rite of baptism with water, which is to be *but once* administered, and by which that spiritual benefit is signified; and they in token of it, are visibly and solemnly devoted to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and are enrolled in the Christian Church, and brought under the strongest bonds, to be entirely and unreservedly the Lord's.

Let it then, once for all, be understood, that the Apostle, when he says, there is *one baptism*, does not affirm that there is one *mode* of baptism. It was the *thing itself*, and not the *mode*, that was in Paul's mind. "This passage, therefore, cannot be adduced to prove that only one *mode* of baptism is lawful, unless it can be shown that the thing referred to here, was the *mode* and not the *thing itself;* and unless it can be proved that Paul meant to build his argument for the *unity* of Christians on the fact that the same *form* was

used in their baptism. But this is evidently not the point of his argument. The argument is, that there was really but *one baptism* — not that there was but one *mode* of baptism." This latter could not save the penitent malefactor on the the cross, and all similar cases, where the outward *form* could not be applied; but the former does, and without it none are saved. Let each one then, carefully look at the *thing itself* — the *substance*, and not at the *form*, the *mode*, or the *shadow;* and then, by the application of water, in the mode he prefers, be solemnly baptized into the name of the same Father, Saviour, and Sanctifier; and then will the argument for Christian *unity* in the passage before us be understood, and not only understood, but likewise *felt* and practiced by all, whether dipt or sprinkled, who have in this manner been consecrated unto God, and devoted to his service. There are two passages in the epistle to the Hebrews, which may be introduced here. The first is in Heb. vi, 2: "*The doctrine of baptisms.*" — The word is in the plural. And not without consistency and propriety. There are, as we have fully shown, two

baptisms, whose necessity is taught by the Christian religion — baptism by water, and by the Holy Ghost, the first of which is an emblem of the second. These two baptisms are stated by the Apostle to be among the elements of Christianity, of which he is here speaking. And every convert was supposed to understand that the application of water to the body in this ordinance, in some mode, was designed to be merely emblematic of the internal purification by the Holy Spirit. To render this passage therefore, as Baptists do — "The doctrine of *immersions*" — is senseless and absurd.

The next passage is in chapter ix, 10. The Apostle treating of Mosaic ablutions and purifications, calls them (diaphorois baptismois) *divers washings;* properly rendered, *different sorts of baptisms.* "These divers washings, or rather *immersions*," says a learned Baptist of Edinburg, (Macclean,) "were to be used on various occasions, both by the priests and the people, to cleanse them from any impurity that they might have contracted, to fit them for approaching God in his worship;" and refers to Lev. xv, 16; iv, 24;

Num. viii, 7 and 19, which, so far as immersion is concerned, is directly against him, as we shall see presently, especially in reference to the two passages in Numbers.

To render the passage "divers immersions," is evidently contrary both to the precepts and facts of the Mosaic law. It does, unquestionably, falsify the word of God. It is a *fact* — a fact that admits of no successful contradiction — that of *persons*, no immersions at all are enjoined under the Mosaic ritual. Let a single example among all the Levitical washings, and ablutions, where *immersion of the* PERSON is required, be shown, and we will yield the point in debate. We have ample authority to state as an indisputable fact, "that no washing of *persons* is ever enjoined by the Hebrew word to *immerse*, even in a single instance, nor by any word that denotes immersion." If there is, why has it never been shown? Whatever was the practice of the Jews, in their ablutions, admit that the washing of the body, or of the flesh, or of all the flesh is enjoined, still as to personal ablution, the injunction could be fulfilled to the letter, without a single immersion.

No immersions of the person, we repeat it, were enjoined. Where can there be an instance found of *immersion by the priests?* In all cases where the subjects bathed, there was no *official* administration. *The person bathed himself.* He performed the ablution *alone.* The assistance of a priest, or crowd of spectators, was no part of the ceremony. Both nature and decency would seem to require the person to be alone. Just look at the condition of the Jews, in the wilderness, at all times, and in all circumstances, while in the desert, during journeys, at home and abroad, does it not at once appear impracticable for every man who became unclean, in the various and numerous ways specified in the ritual, to bathe, or to *immerse* himself? Private accommodations or conveniences in such a state, are not conceivable. And such was the benign regard of God to all these possible contingencies, that he did not enjoin immersion at all.

But let us return to the *diaphorois baptismois* of the Apostle, which properly rendered, is *different baptisms* — or more literal still — *different sorts of baptisms.* The adjective (diaphorois)

signifies different, of various kinds, dissimilar, that is, differing from each other, as in Rom. xii, 6, "Having then gifts (diaphora) differing," &c. So likewise the verb, as in 1 Cor. xv, 41. "For one star (diapherie) *differeth* from another star in glory." These different baptisms, of which the Apostle is speaking, has reference to the several kinds of washing, cleansing, and purifying in use among the Jews in the days of Moses. An immersion is *an immersion* — there can be no difference where the mode is not varied. The scriptures speak of "divers seeds," "divers colors," "divers vanities," "divers weights," "divers tongues," "divers miracles," "divers diseases," and "divers doctrines;" is all this to be understood to mean only *one* color. *one* disease, *one* miracle, *one* doctrine, &c.? It is just as consistent to suppose that divers baptisms, only means *one mode* of using water in baptism.

But the advocates for immersion tell us "the baptism of a number of persons may with great propriety be termed baptisms; for each of them is a distinct and separate immersion — the various immersions prescribed in the ceremonial law of

Moses," (Macclean.) To make the Apostle call the Jewish ablutions divers *immersions*, in the numerical sense, as referring to "a number of persons," each having "a distinct and separate immersion," instead of variety, is not only forcing him to speak what is not true, but what on the very face of the passage, is contrary to reason, analogy, and common sense.

This inspired expositor calls the Jewish ablutions different sorts of baptisms, for the following very plain reasons. There was a distinct baptism of the priests, Exod. xxix, 4, "And Aaron and his sons thou shalt bring unto the door of the tabernacle — and shalt *wash them with water*." There was a different one of the Levites, Num. viii, 7. "And thus shalt thou do to cleanse them; sprinkle water of purifying upon them." Here is an official baptism; it is performed by a *second* person as the administrator, who baptizes with water, applying the element to the person, and not the person to the element. The command is specific, both as to the *thing* to be done, and the *manner* of doing it. I do not recollect of another such instance where the thing itself — the divine inten-

tion is expressed, and the particular mode specified. Here is purification — "cleanse them" — and here is the specific mode, "sprinkle water of purifying upon them." There is still a different one of the Israelites in consequence of contracting certain kinds of defilement. Thus in Num. xix. 17, 18, "And for an unclean person, they shall take of the ashes of the burnt heifer of *purification for sin*, and running water shall be put thereto in a vessel; and a clean person shall take hyssop and dip it in water, and *sprinkle* it upon the tent, and upon all the vessels, and upon the persons that were there," &c. Now, if the Apostle in Heb. ix, 13, 14, does not refer to this sprinkling as one of the divers baptisms, which was practiced among the Jews, then was there no use in comparing Divine dispensations, that of the Jewish and that of Christ, to show the glory of the latter above the former. For says he, "If the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of a heifer,"— the red heifer mind,—"sprinkling the unclean sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ purge your conscience from dead works?"

To these ceremonial rites, again we repeat it, the Apostle alludes when he calls them different baptisms, and confirms it in verse 19, where he affirms that "Moses . . . . . took the blood of calves, and of goats, with water and scarlet wool, and hyssop, *sprinkled* both the book and all people." Now, if Paul affirms Moses *sprinkled* all the people, and does not include this as one of the different baptisms, then may we despair of ever acquiring the true meaning of any author by the use of language, on the acknowledged rules of interpretation and sound exegesis. The fair conclusion, therefore, under such infallible guidance, is, that when "Moses sprinkled . . . . all the people," he baptized them; it being one of the divers, or different baptisms, acknowledged as such, and so called by an infallible expositor. That sprinkling as a mode of baptism, was in the mind of the Apostle when he spoke of those ablutions as he did, there can be no doubt. It was a baptism too, which was emblematic of purification, the very thing that external baptism signifies under the gospel, according to the different ideas of purification in the two dispensations,

the one of the flesh and the other of the Spirit. So when speaking of the spiritual cleansing by the blood of Christ, Paul calls it "the blood of sprinkling," (Heb. xii, 24,) and Peter calls it the "sprinkling of the blood of Christ," (1 Pet. i, 2,) an immersion in the blood of Christ, or an immersion in the Holy Spirit, they never thought of. They attached no such idea to the mode of purification external or internal, whether by blood, by water, or by Spirit.

Before we leave this subject let us observe the summary manner whereby the sprinkling was performed. Water was one of the prescribed means of purification even by itself, and when mixed with the blood, prevented it from coagulating, so that being kept in a fluid state, it might sprinkle the better; the blood and water thus affording an apt emblem of the two-fold benefit of Christ's atonement, justification and sanctification. The wool was used in order to absorb and retain the blood. Then a stalk or bunch of hyssop intermingled with the wool, or so connected with it as to constitute a convenient instrument of sprinkling. It is said of Moses that he

"took the blood and sprinkled it on the people," but Paul says he "sprinkled on (panta) *all* the people." It is not supposed that either Moses or Paul meant to say that the blood was sprinkled on each one of the three millions of people in the wilderness. Fancy Moses standing on an elevated plain, with a large assembly around him; with the instrument of sprinkling just described, he sprinkles water over them from the place where he stood; he might be said to sprinkle it "on the people," though in fact but few might have been touched by it. The act would be equally significant whether the emblem fell on few or many. Here then we have one of the divers baptisms, without the slightest indication of immersion in the whole account given by Moses of the Jewish ritual in the Old Testament, or the apostolic exposition thereof in the New.

While in this course of examination we will adduce several other passages where the word *baptize* is found, in the use of which it seems impossible, without corrupting and falsifying the Bible, to render it *immerse*. The thing signified by baptism, as we have shown, both Jewish and

Christian, was purifying or cleansing. This is the natural, primary, simple idea attached to the ceremonial purifications of things, as well as persons among the Jews, and which, as we have just seen, the Apostle calls *baptisms*, *different kinds of baptisms* — which, *officially* administered by a second person, was performed by the application of water to the persons, and not the persons to the water. Thus employing the element instrumentally, it was familiarly, "John truly baptized *with* water."

The evangelist Mark says, (vii, 4,) of the Pharisees and all the Jews, "When they come from the market, except they wash, they eat not. And many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the washing of cups and pots, and brazen vessels, and tables." The word here translated *tables*, is *klinon*, *beds* or *couches*. It is so rendered in verse 30 of this chapter, and in eight other places where it occurs in the New Testament. The word used is *baptismos*, *baptism* of tables, &c. But to translate the word *immersion* of the couches, on which they reclined at meals, is out of the question. They were large

enough for three to recline upon at their ease. When you consider what cumbersome pieces of furniture these couches, tables, or beds were — fifteen or twenty feet long, by four feet broad, and about four feet high — judge ye, whether they were plunged, after every meal taken upon them. You might as well talk about plunging a high-post bedstead, a sofa, or couch on which you recline daily. To suppose that the beds or couches were immersed, knowing the superstition of the Jews, which led them to practice these purifications many times in a day, would be preposterous. How could they immerse their couches so often without rendering them constantly unfit for use? Having no chairs, and accustomed to sit on these couches, leaning on each other, according to the usual mode of sitting in those days, they could, on leaving them, very readily sprinkle water of purifying upon them, or with the hand, or a wet cloth lightly passing over them in a common sense way, or any other method to suit their convenience, very readily perform an ablution, or purification, to gratify their superstitious notions. An immersion here is out of the question.

But our principal object is the first part of this verse, (Mark vii, 4,) "Except they wash they eat not." The proper translation of the passage is, "except they (*baptisonti*) BAPTIZE THEMSELVES, they eat not." The verb (baptisontai) is in the middle voice, (neither active nor passive,) and being used without the noun denoting the object of the action, it indicated that the agents performed the action for, or upon themselves. Every Greek scholar knows that if the word baptize means immerse, the only proper translation of the word as here used, would be, "Except they immerse themselves." But who can have the assurance, the recklessness, to translate it thus, when it is so well known that there is an entire want of historical evidence — no, not a single scrap of testimony in the wide world to support the notion that the Jews immersed their whole bodies as often as they came from the market.

Their manners and customs have been well known from that day to this; and never was it known or heard of, that they immersed themselves before eating, till *invented* by immersionists as a historical fact necessary to help them out of this

difficulty. But how is the difficulty removed by the following translation of Dr. George Campbell, and adopted by Alexander Campbell, the celebrated Baptist Reformer: "Except they have *washed* their hands by pouring a little water upon them, and when they come from the market, BY DIPPING THEM." The word "*hands*," is not in the original, nor near it, neither are the words, "*by pouring a little water on them*," found there. What must we think of such tampering, such shameful treatment of God's holy word? Call this a translation of the word of God? No, indeed, it is human commentary, a paraphrase, a mere gloss. But this is not the worst. The Holy Ghost in the passage affirms the baptism of the persons, not the hands, which is not, as we have said, in the original text, and no grammatical construction, no correct and faithful translation can be made, giving to baptize the meaning of immerse without making the Bible speak falsehood — without corrupting the diction of the Holy Spirit! There is no alternative; immersionists are driven to the necessity of falsifying the Bible, by making it speak what is not in it, by

inventing a historical fact which has no existence; or do as some have done — give no translation, but substitute a gloss, a commentary of their own, in the place of the words which the Holy Ghost teacheth. This it seems some would rather do than give up their darling immersion.

Let us try another case of similar character to the one just examined. Luke xi, 38: "And when the Pharisee saw it, he marveled that he had not first washed before dinner;" in the original, *baptisthe* — that he had not first BEEN BAPTIZED before dinner. Will any Baptist dare to make a translation here on his principles, and substitute the word *immerse* for the word *baptize*, and say, "The Pharisee marveled that Jesus had not first BEEN IMMERSED before dinner?" No, if he be an intelligent, honest, candid, Bible-loving man, he cannot. He knows it is not true. He well knows, that to do this would make the Bible speak what he believes to be a falsehood. He does not believe that it was the custom of the Jews to immerse themselves before eating, or when they came from the market. Is it likely, does he think, that a whole

nation — "*all the Jews*" — ever held to a practice like this? For so many to immerse themselves, and so often too — several times a day — is altogether incredible. This was not the manner of the Jews in purifying themselves. This they did by the simple washing of the hands with a little water drawn from the water pots, and poured on them, like Elisha, who "*poured water on the hands* of Elijah," 2 Kings iii, 11. It was a mere ceremonial washing, and the water-pots were not of sufficient dimensions to render immersion possible. "They contained only two or three firkins, that is, about ten or twelve gallons, apiece, and they were made small at the top, like a common jar. Yet the washing of the hands with a little water drawn from these pots, and poured on them, was a baptism, that is, a purification of the whole person from ceremonial defilement," John ii, 6.

In the case of our Lord, is it likely that want of *immersion* offended the Pharisee, when it does not appear that he had been to the market that day? Is there any intimation in the whole course of his public life on earth, going about doing good,

that he carried with him constantly a change of raiment (which he must have done, and his disciples too, and all the Jews, if immersion was the custom,) for his accommodation, every time he immersed before his meals? Do our Baptist friends themselves believe that such was the practice of the whole nation of the Jews, or even a portion of them? Dr. Campbell and others, who maintain that the only proper meaning of the word baptize is immerse, cuts a remarkable figure in his translation of the passage before us. Luke, inspired by the Holy Ghost, says, "The Pharisee marveled that Jesus had not first been (baptisthe) baptized before dinner." Which Dr. Campbell thus translates: "But the Pharisee was surprised to observe that he USED NO WASHING before dinner." This great oracle of immersion dares not translate the word baptize here by the word immerse; nor does he find it possible to introduce the word "hands." The first would make the Bible speak falsehood, and the latter would be too gross an alteration of the diction of the Holy Spirit. He therefore gives up all talk about immersing or dipping, and says, "He used

no WASHING before dinner;" and so is after all, driven on to the very ground adopted in our common English translation.

There is one passage more which seems of necessity to imply, that immersion, dipping, or plunging is not essential to the idea of baptism. It is in 1 Cor. x, 2, and reads thus: "All were BAPTIZED into Moses IN THE CLOUD AND IN THE SEA." According to immersionists, all were (ebaptisanto) immersed in the cloud and in the sea. But how were they immersed on this occasion in the cloud and in the sea? Were they dipped — or plunged in the cloud upwards, and in the sea both? This is all over contemptible. But you will say, "Could not the walls of water on each side of them, and the cloud over them, form something like a grave in which they might be considered as buried?" The Apostle says nothing about a grave, or its being *like* or in resemblance of burying or immersion. He says emphatically, they "were all baptized," and that too "on dry land," Heb. xi, 29. In Exod. xiv, 21, "The Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night, and *made the sea dry land.*"

Again, verse 22, "And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground;" verse 29, they "walked upon dry land in the midst of the sea"—and were all *immersed*, were they, *on dry ground?* What, a dry land immersion! The Red Sea, where the Israelites crossed, is computed to be between twelve and twenty miles wide. "The whole company," says Dr. Scott, "could not be less than two millions." This immense multitude, accompanied with "flocks and herds, even very much cattle," from the van to the rear, would require a channel or pass-way through the sea of some three or four miles width, if not more, to let such a multitude through, at the usual rates of marching by "the morning watch, which seems to have begun about three hours before sunrise." Nothing, indeed, but a poetic imagination could find anything like a grave—"a liquid grave," and that too "on dry land," in such an extensive opening as that must have been. And were it not too grave a subject to excite risibility, one could not help being amused at the fanciful inventions of immersionists to save their cause from total ruin. Thus, for

instance, their great Dr. Gill supposes that the water stood up above the heads of the Israelites, and that "they *seemed*"—only *seemed*, mind—"to be immersed in it." He and others suppose that the cloud, as it passed from the rear to the front of the camp, "let down a plentiful rain upon them, whereby they were in such a condition as if they had been dipped all over in water." Is it possible that learned men can so impose upon themselves as to expect that such phantasies of the imagination can be passed off as sound reasoning, proof, or argument, in favor of their darling immersion? The truth is, the cloud on this occasion, was not a natural cloud; it was not a cloud of rain, nor intended to be. Nor do we find any intimation that the waters of the Red Sea sprinkled the children of Israel at this time. In Psalms lxxvii, 16—19, we have a sublime graphic description of a tremendous storm, in the midst of which it is thought by the advocates of sprinkling generally, that "the clouds poured out water" upon the Israelites. This I think is a mistaken view of the subject. This would have been a great annoyance in their passage while in

the midst of the sea. I rather agree with Dr. Scott, "That the destruction of the Egyptians was attended by most tremendous and destructive tempests, thunders, and lightnings, and earthquakes," just such a storm as described by the sublime language of the Psalmist. Whatever ideas man may have differing on this subject, one thing is certain, and this is all we need to know on the present occasion, viz: that the Israelites were *not* immersed. And, although without the slightest authority, let us admit the supposition, how does this after all help the Baptist cause? "In what conceivable sense were the Israelites, even on this supposition, immersed? Is it immersion in water when one is exposed to a shower of rain? We speak of being sprinkled, or drenched by rain, but is it not a violation of all propriety of language to say that a man is immersed in a shower? If the supposition — for there is no proof or reason in the case — therefore, is to be admitted, that rain fell from the cloud as it passed over the Jews, and that this is meant here by 'baptism unto Moses,' then it would follow that sprinkling would be the mode referred to, since this is the only

form that has resemblance to a falling shower." Supposition then in this case won't do; indeed it is not necessary. Nor is it needful to suppose by the advocates of any mode, that water was applied to them at all. Most certainly there was no immersion, or submersion on the occasion, except the Egyptians; of whom Moses says: "The sea covered them; and they sank as lead in the mighty waters." These covered the Egyptians, not the Israelites; very evidently both were not submerged; and any common child can determine which got the "much water." So now, we maintain that the conclusion is inevitable, that the word baptize in this passage, does not of necessity mean to immerse.

Gentlemen of the Jury; we did intend before this to have conducted you to Jordan, Enon, and the Desert. But as we are endeavoring to settle the meaning of the word *baptizo*, which Mr. Waterman admits is the turning point of the controversy, and as he has in his course introduced the subject before he went to Jordan, we, on due consideration, have thought proper to follow in the same course, in meeting his argument.

Let us then advance to what we deem the main particular of immersionists generally. It is found in Rom. vi, 3–13, and Col. ii, 11–13. I make enlarged citations, because the whole subject, or train of the Apostle's reasoning, is not complete without. Here is the main rallying point of Baptists. They feel strong, and express themselves with confidence, and even exultation in speaking of these passages. "I value," says Carson, the great Baptist champion, "the evidence of these passages so highly that I look on them as perfectly decisive." And I know of but two, the famous Baptist historian, Robinson, and Dr. Judson, so long a missionary in the East, who "both admit that the passage in Romans, and the other of course, is misapplied, when used in evidence of the mode of baptism." But our Baptist brethren in general, as I have said, regard the first passage particularly, as an inspired exposition of the mode of baptism — as proving irresistibly, that the rite is designed to represent the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, and of the death, burial, and resurrection of the believer with him. And so long as they feel

themselves strongly sustained by the opinions of modern critics and commentators, such as Doddridge, MacKnight, Chalmers, Hill, Neander, Knapp, Barnes, and a host of others — none of them Baptists by profession — that Paul had an allusion to the prevailing mode of baptism by immersion, it is no wonder that our Baptist brethren feel strong and express themselves with confidence, and even exultation, in speaking of these passages. That immersion prevailed as early as A. D. 61 and 64, when the Apostle wrote the epistle to the Romans and Colossians, we do not believe. That this practice prevailed generally in the ancient Church, in the third and fourth centuries, we readily admit — but not as the scriptural mode. It was a corruption — a human invention. But that Paul had any allusion to external baptism in this, or any other mode, we have no idea, and hope to make it so appear before we are done with the investigation.

If it be admitted that *baptizo* in the command, means to immerse, and yet claiming the right, on the ground of expediency, to practice sprinkling, because in our judgment, it retains the essence of

the command; and let it be conceded at the same time that these passages relate to the external rite, and that the early Church understood *baptizo* as meaning immerse, and practiced immersion for that reason — I say, "when all this is conceded the whole question is conceded. It is a perfect logical demonstration in favor of immersion." But none of these things are so. We make no such concessions. And the admissions from the quarter whence they come, is enough to excite chagrin and mortification. No wonder if the Baptists remain forever unconvinced by such reasoning as this, especially when the men who do not hold with them, practically acknowledge the validity of immersion, by taking their converts down into the water and immersing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, without any correct, intelligent, definite meaning of the rite, either external or internal. How can Pedobaptists consistently and intelligently account for their practice under such circumstances as these? Is it not calculated to uphold and perpetuate one of the most pernicious errors — I mean baptismal regeneration — that has cursed the early Church.

For sad was the day for the primitive Church, when falling into this fatal error, darkness fell upon the deep spiritual import of Paul's sacred words. She was taught that Christ gave to the water, as many do still, a purging power, a mysterious energy to destroy sin, and communicate the Holy Spirit. Thus, in the nineteenth century we are taught by a modern Reformer, (A. Campbell,) that, "regeneration and immersion are two names for the same thing," that "immersion is essential to immediate pardon, and acceptance — has its connection ALWAYS with water;" that "immersion saves us, by cleansing the conscience from its guilt;" that "in immersion a person is purged from all his former sins"; and that, "when the baptized believer rises from out of the water, is born of water, enters the world a second time, he enters it as INNOCENT, as CLEAN, as UNSPOTTED, as an ANGEL." Alas! for the man, or the Church, who is cursed with such darkness as this! The practical influence of urgent appeals to sinners, to come to the "mystic waters," the baptismal pool to wash away all their sins, or bury the old man, &c., &c., could not possibly

have but one result. Baptism by immersion, becomes practically the great thing; and on it, eternal life or eternal death depends. And in all this mournful process, the external interpretation of these texts is almost the great moving power of the whole. "Alas for the religion of Christ! For centuries long and dark, this was almost the only voice of the Church; and let those who attach such weight to patristic interpretation, weigh well, before they give it much authority, that malignant and damnable system — of which it was the essential part.— BAPTISMAL REGENERATION! What tongue can utter the delusion, the spiritual despotism and misery, which have been found in a full cup of water on a guilty world! This view therefore, is not only to be rejected as false, but to be abhorred as utterly pernicious."

Pardon me, Gentlemen of the Jury, for detaining you so long from the main point, by these prefatory remarks. I consider this subject of great vitality and essential importance, and am determined, at the risk of your patience, if I can, to make it as plain as possible.

Before we advance to the main fortress, we must first demolish some of the outposts, level some embankments, remove some rubbish, and other bulwarks, which man's invention has thrown around it. The first and most formidable we meet with, is described in few words thus: "Christ submitted to be baptized — *i. e.*, to be buried under the water by John, and raised out of it again, as an EMBLEM of his future death and resurrection." Or as my opponent has stated it, "Baptism is here (Rom. vi, 4,) compared to a burial in which the believer being 'dead to sin,' is 'buried,' and from this emblematic grave he rises again to a new and spiritual life." To this view of the subject we decidedly object, and enter our solemn protest against it for the follow reasons:

1. *It is not true.* Neither the baptism of Christ nor of any body else was ever intended to symbolize his burial. How is it possible that it could? Christ was not let down into an earthly tomb; he had not one particle of earth thrown upon him; he was not even covered at all, except by a linen shroud; he was laid in the niche of a rock; passed through a lateral door horizontally. Surely

it requires a great stretch of fancy to discern any resemblance between a person's being plunged under the water, and raised out of it, and a body carried into a tomb, or a sepulchre, and left there, and again reviving and coming forth from the tomb by the same door, which were the real circumstances of our Lord's burial and resurrection. Besides, why should baptism be made symbolical of the death of Christ? Where has he so taught his Church? Is there any proof or slightest intimation of it in all God's blessed book? None in the Old Testament. All Jewish analogy is against it. There is no immersion of a person required in all the Mosaic ritual. How could an intelligent and spiritually minded Jew, who was taught that neither "the blood of goats, nor the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean," could do any more of themselves than "purify the flesh," but considered them as the mere emblems of a higher and spiritual purification,— how could he have ever regarded this rite as designed to prefigure the death and burial of Christ, when there was not a single thing that bore any analogy to this in all the ablutions prescribed in the ritual

law; nothing even in those presented by the superstitions of the Pharisees.

2. That the Baptist interpretation of the passages before us is untrue, will at once appear from the consideration that it is a manifest intrusion on the province of the Lord's Supper, and that without the least reason. This sacred rite fully represents, and is intended to comprehend in its significant emblems, all the circumstances connected with the death of Christ. Why then establish one institution to commemorate the death of Christ, and then intrude on its province by another established for a different end? Under the ancient dispensation the emblematic rites were divided into two great classes, viz: those significant of purity, or purification, and those significant of atonement for sin. The Church when she assumed her new costume, or simple form under the gospel dispensation, did not leave her emblematic rites behind. The significant symbols in the new dispensation are a summary of those which existed under the old. They now exist in a simple and milder form. She has her baptismal water, "clean" and "pure," emblematic of purification still; and she has the

Dominical Supper of bread and wine, emblematic of atonement still. Nothing can be more appropriate. Man needed the one and the other, in order to find acceptance with God: the one is the work of the Spirit, and the other of the Saviour, who redeemed us by his blood. The Lord's Supper was established to show forth the Lord's atoning death, until he should come. Baptism indicates the actual purification of the heart and conscience from sin, when the atonement is applied by the Holy Spirit. One indicates atonement by Christ; the other regeneration by the Spirit. Are not these two important and significant rites of separate and distinct consideration? They ought not to be blended or amalgamated. But let water baptism be intruded on the province of the Lord's Supper, and it nearly loses, in ideas of death, burial, and resurrection, all reference to purity. Indeed, it seems to immerse sure enough, and bury out of sight the main idea of the rite, which is *purification* by the Holy Spirit. But immersion, the Baptists all affirm, is the figure of death. But this is not all; their figure not only blends two rites established for different ends, but

which is still more revolting, leaves the Holy Spirit, in his great work of internal purification, without any emblem at all. Strange, that good and learned men, as many of them are, should, for the sake of form, the mere *costume* of religion, or a favorite dogma, leave so far out of view one of the essential doctrines of the gospel, and adopt a sentiment not only at war with the word of God, but in its results, excludes from the Christian Church, millions of God's ministers and people, because they have not been plunged all over in water.

A thought or two more at this point, of similar import, before we advance. Where is then the slightest intimation, in all that Christ said or did, that his baptism by John in Jordan was designed to represent his death, burial, and resurrection? Let the evidence be produced. Moreover, if intended only as an emblem of his death, why did it occur so long *before* his death? and that too without the slightest intimation given to any one, that his baptism was intended as figurative of his death? As Jesus and his disciples "made and baptized more disciples than John," did they

immerse them, instructing them at the time, that what they did by the act of baptism, was to represent the death of Christ? That to worship God acceptably, we must do it understandingly, is a proposition none will deny. But how could the disciples of Christ understand themselves, and then instruct the people whom they baptized, that the ceremony was an emblem of their master's death, when he never taught, or gave them a hint of it, and when as yet, the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, which, in the order of arrangement, was prior to the gospel commission to baptize, containing the appropriate memorials of his death, the bread and the wine, was not instituted until the evening before his crucifixion. Did he on that solemn occasion instruct his Church that in that ordinance she was to "show the Lord's death till he come?" or was she to show that death by immersion? In the Lord's Supper we have the significant emblems of his death, in all its chain of connection and circumstances, and not baptism in any shape or form whatever.

Behold then the two sacraments of the New Testament! How comprehensive and significant.

They unitedly, under the new dispensation, as already intimated, contain a summary of those symbols which existed under the Old. They represent the whole undivided gospel remedy — the eucharist — the special work of Christ; and baptism "*with* water"—"clean water"—"pure water," the special work of the Holy Spirit. Now, if one of these was to be selected as having the preference, why choose that one which occurs but once in the life of a believer, and omit the oft recurring solemnity and influence of the Lord's Supper? Why dwell so constantly and pertinaciously, day and night, upon the endless controversy about baptism? Why the eternal, unceasing outcry of water, water, as though eternal life, or eternal death wholly depended upon being submerged in water. I say, why all this denunciation, proscription, excommunication, in nearly every sermon, while the Lord's Supper is almost forgotten, or laid aside, seemingly of little interest compared with the other symbolical rite of baptism? In the Lord's Supper, there are three things united which we do not find in any other public service,— we there make a public, social,

and separate confession of Christ. In baptism, it is public and separate, but not social; the act is personal and individual, and is but once in the life of a believer. But with other members of Christ's body, with solemn vows around the Lord's table, where the intensely affecting truths as to the death of Christ are practically inculcated by it, with great external power and influence, why should not this solemn ordinance be preferable for general instruction and utility, before the other? Why say so much of the weaker, and yet wholly omit the stronger moral power? I say it with courtesy and kindness,— ought not our Baptist brethren seriously pause and review the position they have assumed, without proof or reason, in reference to the passages under consideration? Or rather ought they not generously and unhesitatingly hasten to relieve the apostle Paul from the incongruous position, the contradictory attitude in which they place him by their interpretations of his language in those passages? We know he gloried in nothing save in the cross of Christ, and so far was he from magnifying an external rite, that in comparison with the gospel, he regarded

it of so little weight, that he thanked God that he baptized none of the Corinthians but Crispus and Gaius, and the household of Stephanus, and affirmed that God sent him not to baptize, but to preach the gospel. Now, when you mark the ground occupied by the great Apostle of the Gentiles, do you think it possible, that this same Paul has, in the place before us, attempted to refute a fundamental objection to this same gospel, by magnifying the influence of this same external rite of baptism? What! at one time ascribe to it in some way, such prodigious power to eradicate sin, and a *sine qua non* to the soul's salvation, and then turn round and thank God that he did not administer it, and declare that he was not sent to do it!

Such, then, are the difficulties, the incongruities, and inconsistencies, which attend all efforts to force an external sense on the baptism and burial spoken of in Rom. vi, 4, and Col. ii, 11. The way, we think, is now prepared for an advance to the main point. We shall take the passages separately, each one by itself. The whole subject in a connected train of reasoning by the Apostle, is contained in

the first thirteen verses (in Rom. vi,) instead of four or five, to which the discussion is generally restricted. Our object will be to exhibit the obvious fact, that all allusion to an external rite, or literal baptism, in any mode, is here out of place. It breaks the chain in the midst, destroys the train of reasoning, perplexes and confuses the mind, and causes a deep and painful feeling of the entire absence of logical proof. Many able commentators, logical minds, and honest enquirers after truth, of all denominations, have felt this. We too have had our difficulties and perplexities on the subject. But after much thought and prayerful investigation, we feel that our way is clear, and can, by the light of truth, follow the Apostle quite through his train of reasoning without involving him in palpable incongruities and inconsistencies, which we find too often done by the elaborate efforts, or careless indifference of some able and undesigning men. We claim no pre-eminence,—make no vain-glorious boast over our well known superiors in biblical theology; nevertheless, we are not prepared to concede, as some of them have done, unintentionally, no doubt, the main subject, not

only to the high gratification of our opponents, but likewise have placed the apostle Paul in a false position he never occupied.

At the outset then, Gentlemen of the Jury, we wish it to be distinctly understood, that we keep out of view all allusion to an external rite, just as if no external rite of baptism existed at all; that the reasoning of Paul in this unbroken chain will apply just as well to the penitent malefactor on the cross, as to the man who has been submerged in the "mystic waters" of Jordan. This is our position, and we ask you to mark it well.

Let us first present, in full, this remarkable passage of the word of God, and then endeavor to ascertain upon what points the interpretation of it turns. It is as follows: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection.

Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead, is freed from sin. Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall live with him. Knowing that Christ, being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once; but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord," Rom. vi, 3–11.

Now, believing as I do, that the external rite is not meant, that such was not in the mind of the Apostle at the time, and that the external interpretation is not only false, but pernicious to the cause of truth and holiness, I take the ground, as before intimated, that the language would have been just as it is, if the rite had been administered by sprinkling alone, or even if there had been no external rite at all.

In the first two verses of this chapter, the Apostle meets a fundamental objection against the doctrine of justification by faith and free

pardon, of which he had been treating in the previous chapter. The objection is stated in the form of a question, verse 1, "What then! shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" The reply is, verse 2, "God forbid: How shall we, who are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" The objection, in brief, is this: Does not the system of free forgiveness of the greatest sins, by the abounding grace of God through Christ, encourage men to sin? The answer is: No, it makes them dead to sin, dead to the love and dominion of sin, so that they cannot live any longer therein. Then the Apostle proceeds in a connected series, or train of masterly argument, no where surpassed in all his writings. And throughout the whole, it must be evident to every intelligent, impartial mind, that the *internal, spiritual* sense is demanded by the general rule of analogy and correct interpretation.

In the passage cited *in extenso*, we find no less than five terms figuratively used, viz: death, burial, resurrection, planting, crucifixion. These expressions read consistently with each other. There must be no incongruity — no break in the

chain, but like the chain in Eph. iv, 4–6, all the links of a homogeneous character. We must have no intermixtures of discordant materials. Keep in mind the close and intimate union between Christ and his members. They are identified as one; "He that is *joined* to the Lord is *one spirit*," 1 Cor. vi, 17. Every expression in this connection, in the passage under examination, verifies the fact of the intimate union and oneness between Christ and the subject *of this baptism*: thus, "baptized *into* Christ" — "baptized *into his death* — buried *with him* by baptism into death" — "Planted *together* in the *likeness of his death* — so also in the *likeness of his resurrection*" — "our old man is crucified *with him*." "If we be dead with Christ we shall also live with him." How can such wondrous union as this be effected by water baptism — by immersion, dipping, plunging, or any other mode? You can see nothing like *literalism* in this whole connection. The unity and identity between Christ and his members may be exhibited thus: Believers are one with Christ *federally*, as their covenant head and representative, in and with

whom they are "circumcised," Col. ii, 11 — "crucified," Gal. ii, 20 — "dead," — Rom. vi, 8 — "buried," Col. ii, 12 — "risen," Col. iii, 1 — and "sitting together in heavenly places," Eph. ii, 6. Thus by a gracious constitution the whole mystic body of Christ were so united *to*, comprehended *in*, and accounted *one* with him, as, in law, to have died in his death, been buried in his burial, and raised again in his resurrection. And *spiritually*, in that they have experienced in their souls a change corresponding with that which Christ underwent in his body: they have "crucified the old man," Rom. vi, 6; are "dead to sin," Romans vi, 11; are "risen to newness of life," verse 4, and have their "conversation in heaven," Phil. iii, 20. This is a scriptural, intelligent, animating view of this great subject. But all the waters of the flood could never accomplish such a work as this. How much to be regretted that outward rites should be magnified above inward graces, and the mere *costume* of religion should have the ascendant above the reality.

In coming then at once to the point, the plain,

emphatic question will be, are the baptism, the burial, and resurrection of the believer, spoken of in the passage under consideration, either of them *external*, or all of them *internal?* According to Baptist interpretation, they hold that the baptism into Christ is external — by "immersion" into his death — and of course the burial and resurrection the same. For plainly, the baptism and the burial here referred to must be alike. If the one is external, so is the other, and if the baptism be internal, by *purification* into his death, so is the burial, and also the resurrection. Our Baptist brethren perpetually insist upon it, that if you have not been buried with Christ in baptism, by being wholly submerged in water, you have not been baptized at all. In answer to this, in the first place we say, there is no evidence, as we have fully shown, in all the book of God, that baptism was ever made symbolical of the *death* of Christ. The passage can't be pointed out, nor any thing like it. Moreover, all Jewish analogy and usage is against it. All the ablutions and sprinklings of the ritual law, were most obviously designed to prefigure and signify *purification*, and

not death or burial of any kind. In the next place, we reply, that such a view of the subject is at war with the Apostle's grand train of reasoning, wrests and distorts the great outlines of the whole picture, and introduces a sentiment so fallacious and pernicious to truth and holiness, as ought not to be tolerated one moment. But this is not all; so far as *literalism* is concerned, the scheme can't be made to work at all. It is wholly impracticable. Let us see: you must be "buried with Christ in baptism," say the immersionists; that is, you must be laid in the "liquid grave" — in the "watery tomb," — in the "liquid and figurative grave of our great leader" — the "sacramental grave of Jesus" — and all that sort of poetic nonsense. Well now, how can you be buried with Christ in baptism, or by immersion, unless you are buried at the same time, and in the same place, in which he was buried? When our Baptist friends sing,

> "'Tis wondrous grace that gives us room,
> To lie interred by such a friend,"

it seems a confirmation of our argument. For

illustration: put a deceased mother and her infant into the same grave, and cover them up at the same time with earth, and one is buried WITH the other; but bury them at different times, and in different graves, and the mother is not buried *with* her child, nor the child *with* her mother.

"But we mean," reply the Baptists, "that the believer, who is to be baptized, must be covered in water *as*, or *in like manner*, as Christ was buried in the waters of Jordan." But this won't do. To be buried *with* Christ, and to be buried in like manner as Christ was buried, are two widely different things; and the Bible says nothing about being buried, or *according to the mode* in which Christ was buried, either in the waters of Jordan, or in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathea. To be buried with Christ literally, would require that we should —

'To lie interred with such a friend'—

be in the same grave with him, while he was in it. When two different persons are, one after the other, dipped all over in water, they are not in

the same watery grave, if it can be called a place of burial at all; they are not buried together; one is not buried *with*, but after the other, and in different cavities made in the water by the descent of each body into it. Let this whole passage, therefore, be interpreted in the internal, spiritual sense, and all is easy, familiar, and harmonious. To exemplify and illustrate the foregoing argument, take the following, Mark xv, 27, "And WITH him they crucify two thieves." Gal. ii, 29, "I am crucified WITH Christ." Very certainly, Paul was not crucified *with* Christ as the two thieves were. In his case, the crucifixion was spiritual, in the other it was literal and external. I have already shown how we are crucified, dead, buried, and risen with Christ in the internal sense and meaning. I have one remark more before I exhibit the parallel, or the analogy between Christ and the believer in the process of the Apostle's reasoning.

We find in verse 6 in the passage before us, the expression, "Our old man." This deserves some notice on account of its aptitude. Our depraved nature is called "man," because it comprises a

complete system of unholy dispositions and affections; and imparts its baneful influence to the whole soul and body—"*Old man*," because derived from the first man — old as fallen Adam, — and so in every one prior to grace, or the image of the second Adam. Thus in Eph. iv, 22–24, "Put off . . . the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your minds; and that ye put on the new man, which after (or by) God is created in righteousness and true holiness." So in Col. iii, 9, 10, "Ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new man which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him." This will at once help us to understand what is meant by "our old man being crucified with Christ, that the body of sin, (our depraved nature) might be destroyed."

And now, Gentlemen of the Jury, we are come to the main point. We are ready for the analogy between Christ and the believer. If I might speak figuratively, we are now at the mouth of the great tunnel — wide — capacious — luminous

— distance short, only ten steps — no obstruction in the way. Let us then, with the Apostle in the lead, enter, and with pleasing animation go right through this important passage.

CHRIST.	BELIEVER.
1. Christ suffered naturally, 1 Pet. iv, 1.	1. The believer suffers spiritually. 1 Pet. iv. 1, 2.
2. Christ in his flesh, *i. e.*, body natural.	2. The believer in his flesh, *i. e.*, body of sin, Gal. v. 24.
3. The members of Christ's body were crucified, Luke xxiv, 40.	3. The members of the body of sin are to be crucified, Col. iii, 5.
4. Christ's body died entirely. All natural life was totally extinct, John xix, 30, 33.	4. The body of sin, the old man, the flesh, is to be entirely destroyed, Rom. vi, 6.
5. Christ's natural death was *for* sin, verse 10.	5. The believer's spiritual death is *to* sin, Rom. vi, 11.
6. Christ was buried naturally, and became invisible in the grave, Matt. xxvii, 66.	6. The believer is to be buried spiritually, and to become invisible in his old character. Rom. vi. 6
7. Christ rose naturally, and appeared in new external glory, Rev. i, 13–15.	7. The believer is to rise spiritually and appear in a new, holy, glorious, spiritual character, Col. iii, 1, Rev. iii, 21.
8. It was the mighty natural power of God that raised Christ, Eph. i, 19, 20.	8. It is the mighty power of God *through faith*, that raises the believer. Eph. i, 19. 20, Col. ii, 12.
9. Christ, after his resurrection, sat down in heavenly places, bodily, Heb. i, 3, Eph. i, 20.	9. Believers sit down by faith in heavenly places, after their resurrection, Eph. ii, 6.
10. Christ dies naturally no more; death hath no more dominion over him, Rom. vi, 9.	10. Believers die in sin no more; death spiritual hath no more dominion over them, John ii, 25, 26, Rev. xx, 6.

Thus, Gentlemen of the Jury, have we passed this passage, as I said at ten steps, without stumbling. And for the form or plan of these parallel analogies, I acknowledge myself indebted, with the exception of the scriptural references, to the masterly work of Dr. E. Beecher, on Baptism,

page 98,— a work, take it all in all, theologically, physologically, and exegetically, is in advance of any other work I have seen on the subject. I consider it unanswerable.

I have only a remark to make in reference to one of the figures used by the Apostle in his admirable train of reasoning. It is in verse 5, "If we have been planted together in the likeness of his death." This is generally quoted in connection with buried with Christ in baptism, to prove immersion. But how, in the name of reason, analogy, and common sense, can this mean water baptism? Planted in the water! Do you plunge or immerse your seed corn in the river, in the pool, or in water at all, when you plant it for a crop? Who ever, being in his right mind, thought that water baptism in any mode, was denoted by the planting of seed in the earth? "We have been planted together." The word here used is *sumphutos*, and does not elsewhere occur in the New Testament. It means intimately connected, or joined together, and is a beautiful illustration of seed sown together in the earth, sprouting together, and ripening together for the

harvest. Christians are united to Christ — "joined to the Lord, and one spirit," and growing together with him as moss, ivy, misseltoe, and such like, grows up by a tree, partake of one common sap, and are nourished by the juice thereof. Thus believers being symbolically planted together with Christ, "may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ: from whom the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, &c.," Eph. iv, 15, 16. To take this beautiful illustration, Rom. vi, 5, from the *internal* sense, as Paul meant, and employ it *externally* to denote baptism by immersion, does evidently not only make him speak what he never intended, but likewise as we have seen, wrests and distorts the whole picture contained in his admirable train of reasoning. But viewed in the spiritual sense no such results follow. Planted in the "likeness of his death," *i. e.*, a spiritual death, like his natural death.

In regard to Col. ii, 11–13, which we reserved for a separate consideration, we shall detain you

ut a moment. From the careful and minute investigation of the collateral passage in Rom. vi, 1–11, nothing can be more certain than the spiritual sense of this passage, which is as follows: "In whom ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: buried with him in baptism, wherein ye also are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead. And you being dead in your sins . . . hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses." Here we have, in verse 11, internal circumcision, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh; in verse 12, a resurrection by faith; in verse 13, an internal death in sin and an internal resurrection to life. Where then is there the least ground for calling the burial an external burial? As we have seen in Rom. vi, 6, the Apostle expressly states that all he has said of the death of the believer is to be understood of the death of the "old man," and the destruction of the "body of sin." But of course the burial and resurrection are as the death. How could it

be otherwise? Therefore, as we have said before, suppose no *external* rite existed, but *internal* baptism only, which existed from the beginning — in the first person regenerated, or spiritually purified — the force of analogy would have called for the use of burial in both these passages. In speaking of the spiritual crucifixion, death, and resurrection of the believer, how could Paul help inserting burial? Nothing can be plainer. But to say, "we are buried with him by *immersion into death*," how incongruous, inconsistent, and unmeaning! *As the baptism so is the burial.* There is no getting over this. If the baptism is *external*, so is the burial; and if *internal*, so is the burial. What God hath united, let not man separate.

And now, Gentlemen of the Jury, we are ready to take you to Jordan. We have detained you the longer on the preceding point, because of its great importance, and the expediency of giving it a thorough examination. Being the last strong hold of immersionists, it became necessary to demolish it, so that other out-posts might the more readily be removed.

Here the Judge suggested the propriety of a short recess, for a little respite and refreshment, which, having been accomplished, the Court, the parties, and all re-assembled, when Mr. Symbolicus proceeded in his argument, as follows:

Gentlemen of the Jury: when my client, John, is called *Baptistes*, *baptist*, in some dozen places in the New Testament, this appellation determines merely his office, and not the manner in which he performed the rite of baptism. The nature and design of his baptism, therefore, shall first occupy your attention, and, afterwards, the mode. This distinction is necessary to prevent confusion, and promote perspicuity. Let it be understood, then, that the baptism administered by John, was not *Christian* baptism. Nevertheless, it was as much from heaven, and was as divinely warranted, as the (*diaphorois baptismois*) *different kinds of baptisms* of Moses, (Heb. ix, 10,) which Paul declares were administered under the Mosaic economy. That John's baptism was not the real Christian baptism, is clearly evinced from the following considerstions, which we present as briefly as possible.

John was a Jew, all over; all his official acts were of that character. "The middle wall of partition," was yet standing, and all that was done pertaining to the kingdom of God, was done within the Jewish enclosure. Even Christ himself, as well as his fore-runner, lived under the old dispensation, and was a strict observer of the institutions of Moses. John's preaching and baptism began six months before Christ entered upon his public ministry. To call his baptism, therefore, Christian baptism, would involve the absurdity of supposing that the initiating ordinance of the Christian system existed six months previous to Christianity itself. If John's were Christian baptism, then the great body of the Jewish nation were Christians; for "there went out to him Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in (or at) Jordan." John baptized none but Jews — none but circumcised persons; he baptized no Gentile, nor any female; at least there is no evidence of the fact; nor did his baptism supercede circumcision, any more than the baptisms of Moses did. All was yet done, be it remembered, within the

Jewish enclosure. Neither was John's baptism the initiatory sacrament and seal of the new dispensation. If it were, it would prove that Christ did not institute Christian baptism, his fore-runner having done that six months before, which is too absurd for a moment's thought; for the law of Moses did not end in John, but in Christ. John's baptism was merely introductory and preparatory to the appointment of the Christian ordinance. He was not a Christian apostle, but a minister under the Mosaic law. "He was sent to prepare the way of the Lord, and preached that the kingdom of heaven, the Christian dispensation, WAS AT HAND," not that it had already come. Again, it plainly appears, (Acts xix, 5,) that persons who had received John's baptism, were afterwards baptized with the Christian baptism. And is it not highly probable that of the three thousand baptized on the day of Pentecost, many of them, had been previously baptized of John, who baptized "Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan," but a short time before?

On opening the Bible, we find three sorts of baptism: that of Moses, that of John, and that

of Christ. The proper estimate of these baptisms is this: The baptism of John was more perfect than that of Moses, or of the Jews, but less complete than that of the Saviour. It was not of the law, but was a specific institution for a special purpose; and being peculiar in its design, it was of only temporary application. In calling the Jews to a new dispensation, John administered this rite of baptism, or washing, to signify the cleansing from their sins and adopting the new dispensation, or their fitness for the pure reign of the Messiah. They applied an old ordinance to a new purpose. "It was," says Chrysostom, "as it were, a bridge from which the baptism of the Jews made a way to that of the Saviour: that of John promised what that of Jesus realized." From these considerations, to which might be added several others, we make the following remarks:

If the baptism by John was not Christian baptism, then it follows that the baptism of Christ by John was not Christian baptism; that is, it was not the baptism which he himself instituted as the initiatory Christian rite into his kingdom. More-

over, the baptism, in his case, was not — it could not have been a symbol of cleansing, though it denoted the purity of his character and of his religion; but it was of priestly consecration, being now in his thirtieth year — the age at which, by the appointment of God, the priests under the law were to undertake the duties of their office.

If John's baptism were not Christian baptism, then what a specimen of weakness and illusion, to hear our Baptist brethren glory in John as "the first Baptist!" That, therefore, they have "the right name," and can trace their descent from him as a founder. But what does such a claim amount to, but that they are the legitimate disciples of John. Such a claim will run them back to Judaism for their origin, and exhibit them as the followers of a Jew; for, verily, John and his followers were Jews and nothing more nor less.

Again: if John's were not Christian baptism, then the baptism of Christ, in whatever mode administered, was no example for Christians. The idea of following Christ into the water — to imitate his example —

"To lie interred with such a friend,"

has such a powerful effect upon many minds as to partake very much of the nature of delusion and superstition. It never has been proved, and never can be, that Christ was buried under the water at all when he was baptized. His being baptized in (or at) Jordan, as we shall see presently, does not prove it. His "going up out of the water," does not prove it. But this by and by. Be, then, the mode of Christ's baptism what it may, the design of it was such, that it could be no example for us to follow. This example scheme will not apply. Why was Christ baptized at all? not as a believer; not as a penitent; not as a convert, or follower of John. Had this been the design of his baptism, why did he not lead the way, and not wait until "all the people had been baptized?" Were they influenced by his example? or rather would it not look more like his being influenced by the example of "all the people?" But this is not all, those who adopt the example scheme, to be consistent, ought to go the whole, and follow his example throughout, at least so far as men are capable of doing as he did. For instance, Christ was not baptized until about

the age of thirty, he was circumcised in infancy; he kept the Jewish Passover; he had no fixed residence; no worldly possessions; engaged in no secular employments after his baptism; received no pecuniary reward for his services. He led a life of celibacy, he retired immediately after his baptism into the wilderness and fasted forty days and nights. Is it the duty of his followers to imitate his example in all these things? Finally, this example, or immersion scheme, furnishes a mantle of such loose and wide dimensions, in which all sorts of errorists, Arians, Unitarians, Mormons, Universalists, Palagians, &c., turn round and round in it, without disturbing its shape, or losing one of their heretical, multifarious dogmas. On this ground all *immersionists* seem united as one brotherhood. But let the *emblematic* scheme be once realized and adopted, and there appears no necessity of seeking a "liquid grave," a "watery tomb," or any thing of that sort, in approaching God in divine ordinances, particularly in that of Christian baptism.

But now let us proceed to ascertain, if we can, the manner in which John performed his great

work of baptizing "all the people." This is, at the outset, plainly indicated by his own language, the import of which is, that he baptized, not *into* water, but *with* water — that he applied the water to the subject, and not the subject to the water. When you chastise your child, you apply the rod to the child, and not the child to the rod; you beat the child *with* the rod. So in making a portrait, you apply the brush to the canvas, and not the canvas to the brush; you paint *with* the brush. So John declares, "Therefore am I come baptizing *with* water." "I indeed baptize you *with* water, but he that cometh after me," &c., "he shall baptize you *with* the Holy Ghost." So in Acts i, 5, "For John truly baptized *with* water, but ye shall be baptized *with* the Holy Ghost." Here the word is in the dative merely, without the preposition, as I have shown before. So in Luke iii, 16, and Acts xi, 16, the idiom being peculiar to Luke, "I baptize you, *udati*, *with* or *by* water." In Matt. iii, 11, Mark i, 8, John i, 26, 31, 33, we have the dative and the preposition *en*, "I baptize you, *en udati*, *with* or *by* water." A further account given of this

matter, by three of the evangelists, is as follows: Matt. iii, 5, 6, says, "Then went out to him [John] Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." Mark says, i, 5, "There went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him." Luke says, iii, 21, "Now, when all the people were baptized, it came to pass," &c.

Here two questions seem to arise, what was the probable number who were baptized by John? and supposing *immersion* to be the mode, what opportunities and capabilities had he for performing this immense work? If we could solve the first question accurately, it would afford greater facility in answering the second. But having no definite data to go upon, we are not authorized to fix upon any particular proportion. The expressions of the evangelists just quoted, and the whole history of John's ministry, sufficiently indicate that the multitude whom he baptized was very great. The whole of John's ministry did not exceed nine months; six months up to the baptism

of the Saviour, and three months after that event. The whole population at that time, by a moderate estimate, was not less, and probably more, than six millions. But to be within bounds, suppose John baptized only one half of the people of Palestine, say three millions. Could he have done this by immersion? It was plainly impossible. But supposing this number allotted to him to be, perhaps, extravagant, we will reduce it to one-twelfth part, or five hundred thousand. We surely will not be required to bring down our figures below this number. Now, allowing nine months as the utmost limits of his ministry, though not employed the whole of that time, as could easily be shown, and deducting forty-three Sabbaths, in which, according to the Jewish observance of the Sabbath, it was unlawful for him to baptize, and there are left in all two hundred and thirty one days, in which, let it be supposed, he was engaged in this service. Now, upon the lowest estimate as just given, suppose him to have stood in the water, and baptized by immersion six hours every day, it would require him to baptize three hundred and sixty-one every hour, and six every minute.

Take the simple statements of the three evangelists, and work it as you will, the immersion of that immense multitude by one man is clearly impossible. His physical strength even were he as strong as Sampson, would not be equal to the task. It is easy to sing, as Baptists do,

> "While in the tide the Baptist stands,
> Immersing the repenting Jews,"

but to realize the whole process, with all its protracted incumbrances and difficulties, is quite a different matter. John, poor fellow, had none of the cunning devices, and inventions of modern times to facilitate and alleviate his arduous task. There were no capacious baptisteries to shelter him and his proselytes from the stormy elements, the beating rains, or scorching sun. No *India rubber*, in those days, to be manufactured into "baptismal pants," to serve as a sort of coat of mail, for the lower extremities of the officiating dipper against the cold element while he stood up to his waist in water. Behold John in his raiment of long, coarse, shaggy camel's hair, with his "leathern girdle about his loins," the common dress of

the prophets, (2 Kings i, 8, Zech. xiii, 4.) Out of this material, a coarse, cheap cloth, is still made, and worn by the poorer classes in the East, and by monks. This seems to have been the only costume our humble client had, with "locusts and wild honey" for his daily fare. Who can imagine it possible for such a man, without a miracle — and "John did no miracle,"—to perform such a peculiar work as he is said to have done, unless by some other method than immersion?

But it may be asked whether, according to our mode, that is, sprinkling them one by one, it was not equally impossible for John to baptize so many? But we do not consider it at all necessary to suppose that he baptized them singly. In a summary way, as we have seen Moses do, with the convenient instrument described for the purpose, when he sprinkled "all the people," John, who was yet acting under the same dispensation, doubtless took a bunch of hyssop, or some other suitable instrument, and making it sufficiently large for the purpose, he could dip it in water, and sprinkle the people, as they came to him in groups or large numbers at a time. On being ranged

along the margin of the river in single file, he could very conveniently, and without bodily fatigue, pass along the whole line and sprinkle hundreds in a few minutes. This he could do too without the aid of "baptismal pants," and without soaking his humble raiment of camel's hair all day in water, and without incommoding the costumes of the immense multitudes who came to his baptism from day to day, and, as is presumable, without any change of raiment. The people came to hear John *preach*, by which they were prepared for his baptism, unexpectedly, before they left the ground. As there was no accommodation for exchange of costume on the ground, do you suppose they retired to their distant homes, right from their "liquid graves," their "watery tombs," all dripping and draggling in their wet clothes? I confess it too revolting to think upon for a moment. We have a fact — a brief historical fact, which we deem not out of place to introduce here. A missionary, Rev. Mr. Coan, of the Sandwich Islands, thus writes: "On the first Sabbath in July, (1838,) I baptized seventeen hundred and five persons. These seventeen

hundred and five persons, I baptized one afternoon, and on the same occasion broke bread to about two thousand four hundred communicants." This looks something like John's work, or rather like the Apostles' at Jerusalem, when they baptized three thousand on the afternoon of the day of Pentecost. Mr. Coan does not state how he baptized so many converted pagans in so short a time. It is quite certain it was not by immersion, both from the fact of his disbelief in that mode, and the impracticability of performing it. And we feel just as certain, from all the circumstances, that John did not — that he could not have baptized "Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan," by immersion. But does not the expression, "were baptized of him in Jordan"—"in the river Jordan," prove, as Baptists affirm, that John's baptism was by immersion? It is asserted by an inflexible immersionist, (A. Campbell,) that "various words, such as *dip*, *immerse*, *merge*, *immerge*, *plunge*, are all indicative of the same action;" and avers this to be "the proper, grammatical, or literal meaning of *baptizo*."

Very well; let us now see how the thing will work. If baptizing (en to Jordane) *in Jordan*, proves immersion, dipping, or plunging in Jordan, then by a similar expression, (Mark i, 4,) we prove immersion in the wilderness; for it is there said, John was baptizing — en to eremo — *in the desert*. Did John dip in the wilderness? Did he plunge in the sands of the desert? Again it is said, (John x, 40,) "That Jesus went again beyond Jordan, into the place where John at first baptized, and there abode." According to the Baptist rule of translation, we must read, "Jesus went again beyond Jordan, into the place where John at first plunged." But give to baptism its proper, intelligent meaning, there will be no incongruity — beyond Jordan, into the place, or locality where John first *purified*.

That John baptized AT Jordan, is the proper meaning of *en to Jordane*, I think is fully established from the following: In Joshua iii, 18, we read, "When ye are come *to the brink* of the water of Jordan ye shall stand still, (LXX, en to Jordane) *in Jordan*." Here coming *to the brink* of the water, is called standing *en to Jordane* —

the very words, letter for letter, used in Matthew and Mark, and cannot mean anything else than AT *Jordan*, or *by the edge of its waters*. This will be further established in verse 13, "The *soles* of the feet of the priests shall rest in the waters of Jordan,"—verse 15, "The feet of the priests that bear the ark were dipped in the *brim* of the water." Here the priests that bear the ark, as they came *unto* Jordan—not *in* or *into* Jordan—just when the *soles of their feet* dipped in, or came in contact with the *brim* of the water, were to stand still *en to Jordane*, AT *Jordan*. This example is decisive, and in conjunction with our preceding remarks, must settle the question as to the proper rendering of the passages in dispute.

But we must not retire from Jordan yet, while the baptism of our Saviour remains without special notice. This case is the main one here, with our Baptist friends, as has been partially noticed already. In Mark i, 9, it is written, that "Jesus . . . . WAS BAPTIZED of John in Jordan." In the original Greek, the word for "*was baptized*" is *ebaptisthe*—was immersed of John in Jordan, say our Baptist friends. I think we have made

it almost certain that immersion in Jordan was not John's mode of baptizing. And here let the form of the word be particularly noticed. It is in the passive voice, had been baptized, and is found in Luke, xi, 38, the same word (ebaptisthe,) letter for letter, in all respects precisely the same; and which we had under special consideration before recess. It is there stated, you recollect, that the "Pharisee marveled that Jesus had not first washed before dinner:" in the original, "that he had not first been baptized before dinner." But if the word baptizo, in its various forms and modifications, must necessarily mean immerse, immersion, &c., then the word here must be rendered, "that Jesus had not first been immersed before dinner." But have we not fully shown that this could not be, without making the word of God speak falsehood. That such never was a Jewish custom, and that some of the most learned and inflexible immersionists themselves, cannot so translate it, admitting that it would not be true. Yet those same translators pronounce it awful presumption, yea, mutilating and disguising the Bible, "corrupting and altering the diction of

the Holy Ghost," to translate the same word, *ebaptisthe*, in Mark i, 9, by any thing else than "*was immersed.*" Have we then one and the same word, letter for letter, in Mark and in Luke, expressing two things quiet different and contradictory? No; "the Scripture cannot be broken." Let us have no such shifting and turning, to confirm infidels in their opposition to the word of God.

Let Mark i, 9, *ebaptisthe*, *eis ton Jordanen*, be read as it should be, at Jordan, and there will be no contradiction: Christ was baptized at the river Jordan. That he was immersed, or put under the water by John, we have no belief. No one has ever yet proved it. To confirm the correctness of this reading, let it be remembered that *eis* when found before the accusative, as it is here, and frequently in other cases where it is employed in the like sense with *en* before the dative, as we have seen, is used by the writers of the New Testament to mean AT, or TO. Thus, Jesus went down, *eis*, TO Capernaum; Jacob went down, *eis*, TO Egypt; they went down, *eis*, TO Attalia; he stood, *eis*, ON the shore, or BY it; Philip was

found, *eis*, AT Azotus; so Christ was baptized, *eis*, AT the river Jordan. The rite of baptism having been completed, both the evangelists say, that the action of going up took place immediately or straightway after the baptism. "And Jesus, when he was baptized," the baptismal rite having been completed, *anebe uthus apo tou udatos*, ascended immediately FROM the water. The preposition *apo*, from, affords no example where it is applied to indicate a movement out of a liquid into the air; this is an important fact, but we defer any further remarks on this point until we come to the case of Philip and the eunuch. All the circumstances detailed here make it a clear case, that Jesus retired *from* the water of the river, by ascending its banks. This is the simple fact, and nothing more can properly be deduced from it.

Before we retire, Gentlemen of the Jury, from the "mystic waters" of Jordan, though it does not bear immediately on the point in hand, yet it has such a general bearing on the whole subject, that we must linger a moment longer to witness the religious raptures, the enthusiastic feeling,

the idolatrous enchantments, exhibited at "Jordan's river," where

> "Meekly in Jordan's *holy stream*,
> The great Redeemer bowed."

The following may serve as one specimen of graphic description, and poetic fancy, by A. Campbell, the great Baptist Reformer:

"When I see such a crowd of earth's great ones, the philanthropists, public benefactors, men of high intellectual and moral eminence, standing on the banks of rivers, in the midst of pools, around the ancient baptisteries, bowing their heads and their hearts to immersion, cheerfully going down into the mystic waters, and there covered with the glories of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, immersed into the faith and hope of eternal life, methinks there is no trial too grievous to be borne, no opposition too great to endure, for the sake of participating with them in these high honors and heavenly ecstacies." But let us listen more particularly to those poetic visions of our Baptist brethren, expressed in religious song, which are found in their favorite

"Psalmist," so highly lauded and extolled almost to "earth's remotest bound." Undisguised specimens of sectarianism there superabound, and doubtless are sung with real sincerity as well as great fervor. We shall notice first, the invocation of the Holy Spirit. The *italics* are ours.

"Come Holy Spirit, dove divine,
On these *baptismal waters shine.*"
"*Shine on the waters*, dove divine,
And seal the cheerful vow,"
"Eternal Spirit, heavenly dove,
On these *baptismal waters move.*"
"Come sacred dove, in peace descend,
As once thou did on *Jordan's wave.*"

Here the idea of the Spirit's "shining on the baptismal waters," and his coming in contact with a material fluid, is coarse, and revolting enough; somewhat bordering on fatuity, if not insulting to the divine Agency. But we shall find a plenty of such poetic phantoms, in the following description of our Saviour's supposed immersion·

"Baptized by John *in Jordan's wave*
The Saviour left his *watery grave.*"
"The Saviour bowed *beneath the wave*
And meekly sought *a watery grave.*"

"He himself in Jordan's river,
Was immersed beneath the wave."

"Buried beneath the yielding wave,
The great Redeemer lies;
Faith views him in the *watery grave*,
And thence beholds him rise."

"Beneath the Jordan's *limpid wave*,
The Baptist lays the Saviour's head,
And thus within the *liquid grave*,
The path of righteousness we tread."

"With thee into thy *watery tomb*,
Lord, 'tis our glory to descend;
'Tis wondrous grace that gives us room,
To lie interred with such a friend."

"Here in the pure *baptismal wave*,
We see an *emblem of his grave;*
Come all who would his laws obey,
And view the place where *Jesus lay*."

"Ready to walk into the wave,
A *lively emblem* of the grave."

"I lay my sinful body *beneath the yielding wave*,
An *emblem* of the Saviour, as *he lay in the grave*."

Gentlemen of the Jury: — You may call this poetry if you choose, but do not call it truth. It is mere fiction, the offspring of a distempered

imagination. This whole scenery, exhibiting Christ, and his humble fore-runner, with "Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan," is altogether of Jewish character. How can our Baptist brethren, as a Christian denomination, satisfy themselves — how can they consistently stand within a *Jewish* enclosure, inside "the middle wall of partition," and express themselves in religious song after this manner. Besides, it is well known that they ofttimes dip their proselytes in stagnant water, in dirty ponds, resorted to by various domestic animals, and infested with frogs and other loathsome reptiles; how does this accord with "Jordan's *limpid* wave," or "the *pure* baptismal wave"— or "Jordan's *holy* stream," down to which "the Lord of life was led?" But enough of this: let us now go to Enon, and see what is doing there. John iii, 23, "And John was also baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was MUCH WATER there." Does not this look very much like immersion? To a rabid immersionist it is demonstrative evidence. He is sure of it.

But how does this look like immersion? If you

could alter one word, a single monosyllable, it would look indeed more like it. If it read, "because there was deep water there," it would alter the case materially. But much water does not necessarily mean deep water. You select a site for a dwelling, or a congregation for a house of worship, because there is plenty of water, by reason of a perennial spring, an inexhaustible well, or a bold fountain, without there being a sufficient depth for a total immersion of a human body at all. Your farm may have much water on it — may be well watered — abounding with springs and rivulets, without a single place to cover a human body,— yea, there is much water at a place of springs, where you could not immerse your foot. This idea is supported by two noted historical Bible facts, the one is 2 Chron. xxxii, 3, 4, where Hezekiah, to defeat the designs of Sennacherib, "took counsel with the princes and his mighty men to stop the waters of the fountains which were without the city." And they "stopped all the fountains, and the brook that ran through the midst of the land, saying, why should the King of Assyria come and find much

water." This "much water" consisted not of rivers and torrents, but of several fountains, and the small brook Kedron, all of which could be easily controled and so managed as to be stopped, and thereby, the enemy frustrated in the use of them.

The second case is that of Moses. where on the same general principle of convenience, he was induced to select, as John wisely fixed upon Enon, a very similar place of sojourn in the wilderness, and, no doubt, for precisely the same reason. Exod. xv, 27, "And they came to Elim, where there were twelve wells of water, and three score and ten palm trees; and they encamped there by the waters." An encampment of soldiers is made on the same principles; the wandering Arab is prompted by the same motive to pitch his tent, and the traveling caravan to form an encampment; yea, in every religious camp-meeting, a place is selected where there is a good supply of water — though immersion might not have been thought of, nor one person should be immersed during the whole services. Hence it appears that the ample supply of water, this necessary of

life, was the chief motive for the selection, by John, of both Jordan and Enon.

But what do we know about Enon? Is it a river? — a lake? — a pond? or what is it? It is not either of them. It is the name of a place near Salim, and not a river or anything like it. There John baptized, for the reason given, because there was "much water" — literally, "many waters," there; and the terms evidently designate several small streams or wells, like those at Elim, not a body of water suitable for dipping or plunging. They naturally suggest that John baptized at the springs from which the place took its name, which is *fountain*. It is found no where else in the Bible; and Josephus, who describes all the principal fountains of Judea, never so much as names Enon; and another fact is, that a solitary well is all that now remains to mark the position of this far-famed place of much water, where there is no shadow of evidence that a single human being, male or female, was ever baptized by immersion. The selection of this place by John, for baptizing, has given it all the notoriety it ever had. Robinson, the celebrated Baptist historian, tells us, that

"Salim was, at least fifty miles north, up the river Jordan, from the place where John had begun to baptize. Enon, near it, was either a natural spring, or artificial reservoir, or cavernous temple of the sun, prepared by the Canaanites, the ancient idolatrous inhabitants of the land." "It is difficult to say what is the precise meaning of the Evangelist's word, Enon, and it is not certain whether the plain meaning be, John was baptizing at the Dove Spring, near Salim, or John was baptizing at the Sun Fountain near Salim." Whatever the difficulties of the historian might have been, we admire his candor in yielding the point as to the meaning of *en Ainon* "in Enon," which he translated, as cited above, *at* the Dove Spring, or *at* the Sun Fountain." Now, when it is so well known that "*en*," when used as it is here, before the name of a place, commonly signifies "at," it must be admitted that this is its meaning, when we read "in Enon," and "in Bethabara." And why should any one hesitate for a moment to admit that the words "*at* Enon," and "*at* Bethabara," would exactly convey the import of the expression? But the same term is

used when "Jordan," follows it — "in Jordan." To be consistent, let not a different construction be forced upon the same term, but read it all alike, "at Enon," "at Bethabara," "at Jordan," and all difficulty and incongruity is removed.

And now, Gentlemen of the Jury, before we part with John and Enon, and "Jordan's holy stream," let us review, for a moment, the whole scene and circumstances. There is my humble client John — according to Baptist notions, the most extraordinary man that ever lived. He is a *Jew* all over, and yet the "first Baptist," from whom the denomination called Baptists, boast of their ecclesiastical descent. He is no giant, nor Sampson in regard to physical strength. And as "John did no miracle," he must have possessed the physical powers only of a common man. And it seems to me, that one must possess an extraordinary measure of that faith which removes mountains, to keep longer now, from being crushed to the dust, by the theory of John's baptism, oppressed with such gigantic difficulties as do evidently encumber it. I see not what sustains the whole fabric but an adventurous

course of bold, proofless, unwarrantable assertion. "Why, if the forerunner of Jesus was such a Baptist as they make him to be, he must have spent all the days of his ministry up to his waist in water, dipping and plunging, with breathless haste and undiminished vigor, the myriads who flocked to his baptism. The wet and weary work which our Baptist brethren assign to the honored herald of the Messiah, especially if he immersed all his converts, must have wholly absorbed both his time and energies, and have left him in a state of complete exhaustion. Can you conceive it possible for a modern Baptist minister, to survive the experiment of a month's labor, such as they impute to John? As there is extreme danger in immediately descending from the pulpit to the water, it is a dictate of prudence to have two ministers to be engaged at these services; one to preach, and the other to dip the converts. This will preserve the preacher, after he has heated his blood near to the boiling point by his advocacy of much water, from the impending danger." But John had no such auxiliary as this. He must do all the arduous work himself, alone; and that,

without the modern and luxurious preservatives, such as "Baptismal Pants, Macintosh Overalls, and Mud Boots." Neither were there among the ladies, if such were there, the convenient article known as "Baptismal Robes," or any such human invention, as security against discomfort and disease. You see no proud baptistery, as I have reminded you already, as a covert from the storm, and a preservative from the vertical rays of the sun. Was there ever such a mere man on earth as this John the *Dipper*, whose clothing was coarse camel's hair, and his living "locusts and wild honey?"

Gentlemen of the Jury, before we take you to Philippi, Damascus, and the Desert, to see how the Jailer, Saul of Tarsus, and the Eunuch were severally baptized, we must "tarry at Jerusalem," a short time, to see, if we can, by what process the three thousand could have been dipped at that city, on the very day of their conviction. On this occasion — the celebration of the Pentecostal festival — there was collected not only a vast multitude of Jews, but also foreigners, "Parthians, Medes, Elamites, dwellers in Mesopotamia, Judea,

Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt, and in the parts of Lybia about Cyrene, and strangers of Rome, Jews and proselytes, Cretes and Arabians." For such immense crowds, in a hot season, large quantities of water would be required for their accommodation, as well as for the religious washings of native Jews and proselytes. But can you even surmise in what part of the city, or from what source, especially during the passover, when water was so precious, a sufficiency could be procured for the immersion of three thousand persons? "The brook Kedron on the east side of Jerusalem, is nothing more than the dry bed of a winter torrent, bearing the marks of being occasionally swept over by a large volume of water. No stream flows through it, except during the heavy rains of winter, when the waters descend into it from the neighboring hills. But even in winter there is no constant flow."—*Kitto*. "It is a characteristic of the region round about Jerusalem," says an old experienced missionary, Rev. Eli Smith, "for a considerable distance, that it contains no running streams. The Kedron . . . is certainly without

water. I have inquired of friends who have lived in Jerusalem for years, and been assured by them that they have never seen any water in it, winter or summer, except that, below the city, after its union with the valley of Hinnom, a well in it, which is called the well of Nehemiah, overflows late in the winter. We must, says he, understand by the word translated brook, no more than is meant by the Arabic *wady*, viz: a valley with or without water."

As the Apostles had no place, under their control, for the immersion of such a multitude as were there baptized, the question is, where could they have baptized three thousand converts by immersion, dipping, or plunging? — and that, too, in five, or six hours at most? Can you tell me likewise, how this great multitude were so speedily prepared for the service, and the whole affair dispatched with so much ease and expedition, as the inspired narrative would lead us to suppose? Do you imagine that they were suitably dressed for the occasion, or that each of them brought a baptizing suit under his arm? You can make no such supposition, unless you can believe, or rather

surmise, that these foreign Jews, and others, who had been drawn by mere rumor to the place where Peter was preaching, without the least conception of the result, must nevertheless have had some pre-intimation, or indefinite impression, that something, they could not tell what, was to happen that might require some such foresight or preparation. But this needs no rebuke,— it is hardly surmise itself,— it could be nothing but mere hallucination, if it had any existence at all.

But here another difficulty arises, on the immersion scheme; and that is about the time which must have been consumed in this process. After the close of Peter's sermon there were not more than five, or at most six hours of the day remaining. Yet the inspired account states they were baptized and added to the Church "the same day." I have seen various suppositions and calculations on the apportionment allotted to each of the Apostles on this occasion; the two following are the most plausible. To have immersed them all in five hours, each of the Apostles must have immersed more than fifty persons every hour, and more than five persons every six

minutes! This you need not say, would have been physically impossible; especially where there was no relaxation.

The other plan of calculation allows the Apostles six hours to be engaged without relaxation in their wet and weary work. Allowing one hundred and eighty to each Apostle, and multiply that number by twelve, (the number of Apostles, Acts ii, 14,) and you will have a total of two thousand one hundred and sixty. To have gone beyond this in the process of immersing, was physically impossible. To have gone no further, would have left nearly one-third of the converts unbaptized. But we must not forget to take into the account, the supposition, that no preparation whatever was requisite for this multitude; that every thing was perfectly ready, and immediately at hand; that there was a river or reservoir just at the preaching station, with suitable dresses, separate apartments, and every other requisite for the service. Verily, the Apostles must have performed the rite of baptism by sprinkling, according to the prevalent mode of purifying among the Jews, or as Mr. Coan did, when he baptized seventeen hundred

and five converted Sandwich Islanders, in one piece of an afternoon.

And now, Gentlemen of the Jury, let us turn towards the "desert," and examine that noted case which we are told is so plain, and decisive in favor of immersion, as to have satisfied so many thousands of its being the proper mode of baptism. It is the occurrence of the baptism of the Eunuch, recorded in Acts viii, 38, 39, "And he commanded the chariot to stand still, and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water," &c. This whole affair depends very much, if not altogether, upon the Greek participles here rendered *into* and *out of*, which might with equal propriety, be rendered *to* and *from*. They therefore teach us nothing certain as to the mode of baptism. Philip was in Samaria, and the angel of the Lord directed him to "go towards the south, unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza, which is desert." On his way he met the Eunuch, who was a Jew of Ethiopia, and was returning from Jerusalem where he had been to worship. The account

says that "as they went on their way, they came to a certain water." The Greek word here translated *certain*, is *ti*, which does not indicate, as the English reader might imagine, a river, a fountain, a pool, a rivulet, but simply *some* or *any* water. And having the sense of a diminutive, might, with strict propriety, be rendered, "they come to a *little* water." And this seems further indicated by the evident emotion of the Eunuch when he exclaimed, according to the literal translation of the original, *Behold water!* The presumption that there was a river in the desert, or anything like it, in which the Eunuch was immersed, is all a fancy. No such river, or body of water has ever been found there, after full research, to the present day. But suppose it to be a small stream or spring of water, what then? The chariot, by command, is made to stand still near the margin. From the chariot you see both Philip and the Eunuch (*katebesan*) *descend, eis to udor, to the water.* This is not the baptismal action. It is only preparatory to that act. It was an act wholly distinct from the baptism. If they went into the water at all, they were in the

water before the baptism was performed. Their going to the water, or into the water, then, was no baptism. But after the baptism, it is said, *anebesan ex tou udatos*, *they ascended from the water*, into the chariot again, no doubt,— all dripping wet, if immersed, certainly; for there is no account of any change of raiment, or any preparation for such an action as immersion. While it is contended that the preposition, *ex*, here, indicates their having come out of the water, yet this is by no means necessarily implied; for the verb *anebaino*, which is never employed in the sense of emerging from a liquid substance, forbids us thus to construe it. Apply this to the case of the Saviour, where it is recorded, Matt. iii, 16, "And Jesus, when he was baptized *anebe euthus apo tou udatos*,— *ascended* straightway *from* the water. Thus it is evident, that to go up from the water, is to ascend the bank of a stream, pool, or fountain; so, to go down to the water, is to go down the bank of such stream, or pool, and to come to the water. The Greek word *apo*, rendered "*out of*" in Matt. iii, 16, is generally translated *from*. It is so rendered in two hundred and thirty-five instances

within the first five books of the New Testament; and it is rendered *out of*, in but *forty-two* instances within the same limits. Every schoolboy in Greek, knows that *from* is its most common and appropriate signification. That *eis* with the verb *Katebaino*, as in the case under consideration, often means going down to a place, is quite certain; for example — *Jesus went down (eis) to Capernaum; Jacob went down (eis) to Egypt; they went down (eis) to Attalia; they went down (eis) to Troas; he went down (eis) to Antioch; going down (eis) to Cesarea.* Such instances are so common indeed, when the meaning of *eis*, where it designates direction to a place or toward it, that it occupies, with some of the oldest lexicographers, its first and leading signification. The above is only a sample; we might quote *ad libitum*.

But we have not done yet with the case of Philip and the Eunuch. If they both went down into the water, and this is meant to designate the action of plunging or being immersed into the water as a part of the rite of baptism, how can the conclusion be avoided, that Philip was baptized

as well as the Eunuch? The inspired writer says, "they went down both into the water," and if this be certain evidence of immersion, then there must have been a re-baptism of Philip, so that, singular as it is, he must have baptized himself, as well as the Eunuch. Let the following incident serve as a practical exemplification. We have it from a veritable source, an eye witness of unquestionable reputation.

In Warren county, Ky., some years ago, on one fine Sabbath afternoon, a stout man was to receive the rite of baptism by immersion. The action took place just below a mill-dam. The congregation, as is customary on such occasions, was large. The parties both went down into the water — up to the waist. Philip plunged his subject all over under the water. But alas! being somewhat cumbersome on account of his corpulence, and the rocks slippery on which they stood, the operator's feet betrayed him, and losing his balance as he attempted to resurrect his convert from the "womb of waters," down he went, all over, head and ears, in the water, from whence, after splashing and floundering awhile, almost to

suffocation, he was rescued by the timely aid of the man who had recovered his balance, and restored the preacher to an erect posture, which, as soon as he obtained, and articulation was regained, he pleasantly exclaimed, "*Eh! I believe Philip went under too that time!*" By this time the gravity of the whole congregation being disturbed, it was succeeded by a scene of perfect levity and merriment.

Take another actual occurrence, which capitally illustrates the point before us. A Methodist minister and an Immerser, were baptizing at the same time and place, by the water side. The Immerser took his candidate, and while going down, he said, "And they went down into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch," and after immersing him, he came out, saying, "And they came up out of the water." Many of the spectators, doubtless, were fully satisfied with this oracular proof of the necessity of immersion. Thousands never go beyond this for the establishment of their creed respecting the rite of baptism in this mode. Next, the Methodist minister took his candidate, and went down into the water,

repeating the same words, "And they went down into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch," and then took water and poured it upon his candidate, according to the frequent practice of that denomination, and came up, repeating, "And they came up out of the water, both Philip and the Eunuch." Thus the words of Scripture were as pertinent to the one case as to the other, and one may do all that Philip is said to have done, without immersing.

One illustration more, and we dismiss this case. It is one in which your humble speaker was principal actor. About thirty years ago, a man of intelligent mind, but of strong Baptist prejudices, occasionally heard us explain the nature and mode of baptism. He was yet unconverted; but the sentiment maintained, that external baptism was emblematic of internal, by the Holy Spirit, was firmly fixed in his mind as the correct doctrine. Moreover, as to the mode or manner of its application, he as firmly accorded with the lecturer, as was known afterwards, that, analogous to the Holy Spirit's declared manner of operation, the water should be applied to the subject, and not

the subject to the water. These were fixed sentiments in the mind of this man prior to conversion. Subsequently, attending our lecture on the parable of the Prodigal Son, as a second service on Sabbath afternoon, the Lord was pleased to open his eyes to see his lost condition. It was not long before he received Christ into his soul, and asked for admission to the Church. He was received, and at his special request, for reasons not necessary to be here repeated, was baptized in a small river close by. He did not ask to be *immersed*, as neither he nor the minister believed it to be the Scriptural mode. He wished the water to be copiously poured upon him from a a vessel, while kneeling in the stream, a short distance from the shore. He admitted the principle to be the same, of applying water to the person, and not the person to the water, whether it were done in the river or on the church floor. Seeing no impropriety or incongruity, in this transaction, the request was complied with. After sermon, the whole congregation, men, women, and children, some on horseback, and some on foot, repaired to the river in sight of the church.

It looked altogether like a Baptist affair, sure enough; and so a stranger would have taken it on first sight. After the usual services of prayer, &c., at the water side, the candidate stepped into the water a short distance, and kneeled down. The administrator, standing on the margin close by, with a hand-bucket about two-thirds full, poured the whole upon him, baptizing him in the name of the Father, the Son, and Holy Ghost. Having previously gone down into the water, I took him by the hand, and we both came up straightway out of, or from the water, "and he went on his way rejoicing." Being about to remove in a few days to a distant county, I went next day to his house, about ten miles distant, and, by his special request, baptized his four children, by pouring a little water upon their foreheads, agreeably to his wishes. He was early chosen an elder of the Church where he removed, and so continues to the present day, aged and infirm, but accepted and loved by all.

Just one or two remarks here. Had this transaction, as I said to the congregation on that occasion, been taken down without reference to

the parties, the denomination, or the mode of baptizing, but simply stating that T. C., the minister, and R. T., the candidate, went down into the water, and he baptized him, and then came up out of the water, &c., and then read the simple fact a hundred miles distant, in the presence of any Baptist association, it would all pass off as a Baptist affair, certainly, without awaking any suspicion that it was any thing less or more. On the day when this transaction did take place, there were a number of Baptists present. They were considerably divided in their judgments about the matter. One said, "Well, one step further, and Mr. C. will be a Baptist." Another said, "There was 'much water' on the occasion, and as the man was covered all over by it, he thought it might do for a valid baptism." Another cut the matter short by saying, "It was no baptism at all." But, finally, taking all the circumstances of this case of Philip and the Eunuch, which has been so much relied on, and so often quoted in confirmation of the views of immersionists, what does it amount to? At best it is only circumstantial, and even that will not anything like

support their cause. Indeed, they are found to support the opposite doctrine, and render it highly probable, if not certain, that the Eunuch was baptized by sprinkling or pouring.

And now, Gentlemen of the Jury, leaving the desert, where we have tarried longer than was expected, let us go to Damascus, "into the street which is called Straight, and inquire in the house of Judas for one called Saul of Tarsus." Here is a case of the greatest importance; one, if we mistake not, that amounts to moral demonstration. Our opponents, generally, do not like to go to Damascus for proof of their mode of baptism, and on the present occasion, the prosecutor has not even looked that way at all. Our friend, Ananias, is particularly implicated in this case, and if we do not succeed in clearing him most triumphantly, we may despair of all the rest. The case of Saul's conversion and baptism is recorded by Luke in the 9th chapter of Acts. The occurrence took place "in the house of Judas;" there Ananias, under divine instruction, was seen in a vision "coming in"—he "entered in the house," and there was Saul baptized—in a private house.

There is not the shadow of evidence that they went out to seek any other place for baptism. Nor is there anything like a pool, a baptistery, or anything of the sort, which was used on the occasion. The conclusion must be, that the rite was administered "in the house," where Saul spent three days, darkling and fasting, and that he was baptized in an erect posture. In verse 18, it is said, that Saul "received sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized." The word translated *arose* is *anastas*, the proper meaning of which is, "*to stand again, to rise from a sitting or recumbent posture.*" It is a Greek participle of the second indefinite form, from the verb *anistemi*. It may be rendered, *rising up — having arisen* — or *standing up*. It is compounded of *ana*, *again*, and *stas*, *standing*. This compound form is of great importance to us here, as it goes directly to establish our point. Its beauty and force will be seen at once, when explained and understood. You see a man yonder in an erect posture, standing; he has as yet, assumed no other posture. In calling our attention to him, you say, "see that man yonder, *stas*, *standing*."

Here you use the simple form of the participle only. But now let that man assume a recumbent posture, sitting or lying, and then resume again his first position, in calling our attention to him as before, you must use the compound form, and say, "see, the man is *anastas*, *standing again*." Plainly, then, the passage ought to read thus: and he, Saul, standing again, or, having stood up, was baptized. Do you think he arose, or stood up, and was plunged, dipped, or immersed. But it is affirmed by some, that Saul must have got up, before he walked, in order to his going off to some stream, river, or pool, to be immersed. This would be at once to falsify the account of the inspired historian — it is also making new history. Besides, the verb *anistemi*, of which *anastas* is the participle, never conveys the idea of motion from a place, but always the action of rising up, or standing up. It has no locomotive character. In plain speech, it is a standing, not a walking verb. Take the following instance: When Christ said to Matthew, "follow me;" he immediately "arose and followed him,"— *anastas*, *ekolouthesen auto*. Here *anastas* put Mat-

thew on his feet, and could do no more, it could not make him walk. It was, therefore, necessary to employ another verb, *ekolouthesen*, to remove him. There is no such assistance, however, employed in Paul's case. He simply arose, on the spot, and thus standing up, was baptized.

This case we consider entirely conclusive. But to make assurance doubly sure, we will cite a few passages that go to confirm the meaning of the word *anastas*, which defines the posture of Paul, when he was baptized. Mark xiv, 60, "And the high priest (*anastas*) stood up in the midst and asked Jesus;" Acts i, 15, "And in those days Peter (*anastas*) stood up in the midst of the disciples," &c; Acts v, 34, "Then (*anastas*) stood there up one in the council, a Pharisee, named Gamaliel," &c.; Acts xi, 28, "And there (*anastas*) stood up one of them named Agabus," &c.; Acts xiii. 19, "Then Paul (*anastas*) stood up, and beckoned with his hand, said, Men of Israel, and ye that fear God, give audience." Now, though all the rest are in point, let us apply this last case only. Is it not as true that Paul, *anastas*, stood up, and was baptized, as that Paul, *anastas*,

stood up, to address an audience? Here is the identical word, letter for letter, used in both cases. And suppose the translators had said Paul stood up and was baptized, as they have said from the same word, the high priest stood up — Peter stood up — Gamaliel stood up — Agabus stood up — Paul stood up, &c., would it not have saved thousands from the great inconvenience, as well as risk of life and death, by plunging all over in "the grave of waters," to get their sins forgiven, which blessing has been obtained by myriads, without having to

> "Dive like wild-fowl for salvation,
> And fish to catch regeneration."

Our Baptist friends being wholly destitute of proof or argument in this case, to sustain their immersion scheme, have resorted to the workings of fancy, and drawn on their imaginations to correct the inspired writer, and supply the facts that Luke omitted to state. Here, for instance, is a poetic, fancy sketch, by an old Baptist minister — invented probably in his early days, and used all his life — who was familiarly and extensively

known in this state as "father Taylor." This old father saw Ananias and Saul, feeble and weak as he was — on their way to some river, stream, or pond, in search of a "watery tomb," to bury the newly converted man in a "liquid grave." To the old father, the vision was as clear as day!

"See what a heavenly hurry Saul was in, though weakened down by a distressing fast; behold him, with great weakness of body, and load of his guilt, staggering along to the water. I almost fancy I see the dear little man, (he was afterwards called Paul, which signifies little,) hanging on the shoulders of Ananias, and hurrying him up, with his right arm around him; and, as they walked on, saying, Be of good cheer, brother Saul; when you are baptized, your sins, or the guilt of them, shall be washed away."

There it is to the life. And if uttered in the plaintive, whining tone, customary with most Baptist preachers in those days, it, doubtless, had a powerful effect on many in the audience, who saw the scene so vividly depicted by the preacher — with deep sympathy and flowing tears. No doubt

many a tear has been shed under the plaintive exhibition of this poetic image. Alexander Campbell, too, though very evidently having less poetry in his composition than father Taylor, saw the vision likewise, and has supplied the defects of Luke's account, with the following scrap of history. See Christian Baptist, page 422.

"Had any person met Paul and Ananias, when *on their way to the water*, and asked Paul for what he was going to be immersed; what answer could he have given, if he believed the words of Ananias, other than, I am going to be immersed for the purpose of washing away my sins? or had he been accosted *on his return from the water*," &c.

Here these two rabid immersionists, the one in poetry and the other by fabricated history, without even the shadow of Bible evidence, must have Paul immersed any how. But it won't do. Men who can resort to such subterfuges, and substitute vain conceits, proofless assertion, bold assumption, fabricated history, and what not, in the place of Bible proof and honest argument, ought to blush and be ashamed of themselves, and give up a

cause that can't be supported without such disengenuous means and efforts.

Once more, Gentlemen of the Jury, and I shall have finished my enumeration of facts and circumstances which go to show the impossibility of immersion in baptism. I wish to lead you to Philippi, and see what occurred in the dark prison there. The baptism of the Jailer and his family is recorded by Luke in Acts xvi, 33, 34, and is still more conclusive, if possible, in illustration of the mode of baptism practiced by the Apostles. All the circumstances detailed in this account, with great simplicity, plainly show that immersion was out of the question. We deem it unnecessary to transcribe the account. It is familiar to all. Let us suppose Paul and Silas to be Baptist preachers. Here was, especially in the dead of night, one of the most unpleasant and inconvenient places into which such worthy men could have been thrust — even "into the prison, and their feet made fast in the stocks." A divine interposition takes place, "at midnight." There was an earthquake, which shook the foundations of the prison. The doors were thrown open and the

bands of the prisoners loosed. I need not detail all the circumstances up to the point of the baptism.

How is that to be performed in such a place and under such circumstances? There is no intimation of the presence of a bath suited to the performance of an immersion. Nor is it likely that a jail, in those days of cruelty, would be furnished with such accommodations as were not to be found in the habitations of luxury and wealth. What, then, must these immersionists do? They must create a bath, or construct a baptistery in an eastern dungeon, change apparel, and make other preparations to stand up to the middle in water until the jailer and his family were dipped; and all this, too, in "the same hour of the night" on which he was converted; or, not finding these accommodations within the prison walls, they must venture without authority to open its doors, to pass out with the jailer and his household, amidst the great crowd, all trembling and agitated by reason of the earthquake, away through the city to some river in the neighborhood; and having well dipped the converts in

the dark, and led them back again, drenched and dripping, with wet apparel, themselves in safety restored to their cells again, if not to the stocks. Take this case as you please, either in or out of doors, and the whole thing is impracticable, not to say impossible, on the immersion plan. But there is not the slightest evidence that the jailer and his family were plunged into the water, at their baptism, but strong presumptive evidence against it. Indeed we have every circumstance to indicate that water was brought in, as at the house of Cornelius, and applied to them by *sprinkling*.

And now, Gentlemen of the Jury, "What shall we say to these things? For in conducting this argument we have been concerned, not with the Greek classics, ancient fathers, nor with human imaginings and the authority of names, but with things and facts, as they are presented in the book of God. We have examined all the important passages in the New Testament, which have a bearing on the point at issue, and in none of them have we discovered any thing to favor immersion as the Scriptural mode of Christian

baptism; not even a word or incidental remark, much less a fact that so much as seems to require immersion. On the contrary, the teachings of the Bible preponderate overwhelmingly on the side of baptism by sprinkling, and force upon us the belief, that this was the mode in which baptism was administered by the Apostles, in obedience to the Saviour's command."

On this subject, which I feel to be of great importance, I have yet many things to say; and wishing to accomplish my task thoroughly, leaving no stone unturned, I shall proceed in my remarks after a somewhat discursive manner, introducing such facts, incidental circumstances, and miscellaneous matter, all bearing on the general subject before us, and tending to substantiate the ground we have taken.

Here the Judge interposed, and suggested that as the evening was approaching, and from the intimation just made by the speaker, it was not likely that there would be time to finish the case now before the Court, that, therefore, to give all parties a fair and equal opportunity,

he would adjourn the Court until to-morrow morning, nine o'clock, which he accordingly did.

At the appointed time, the Court and all having re-assembled, Mr. SYMBOLICUS resumed his argument, as follows:

GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY: — Let it not be forgotten that the *mode* of baptism is not *baptism* — not that "One Baptism," the baptism of the Holy Ghost, which is as old as the first human being ever saved by the "washing of regeneration." *But outward baptism is an emblem of the work of the Holy Spirit on the human soul.*

The first emblematic sign of spiritual purification, was sprinkling: Num. viii, 7; Ezek. xxxvi, 25. Now, so far as mode is concerned, it is only implied in the command, and not explicitly enjoined. It is in vain for any one to contend that the mode of applying the water in baptism, is explicitly defined in Scripture. We have fully shown that immersion, the most impracticable and onerous of all modes, is supported by no Scripture

authority. Let such authority be shown, enjoining immersion as the only mode, and we will all obey. Show us a *fact*, even a word or incidental remark, that *seems* to require immersion, before we are proscribed and excluded from the visible kingdom of Christ, as not being his legal members.

There are two serious errors into which our Baptist friends have fallen. The one is in making the water of baptism a *grave* — a "liquid grave," to represent the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. A palpable error this, as we have fully shown. What resemblance is there between the mode of baptism by immersion, and the interment of the dead? Who ever saw a dead body *plunged* into the earth at its burial! Was the Saviour's body buried after this manner? Again we ask, where is the resemblance? The next error is, "They make the MODE THE ESSENTIAL THING IN BAPTISM, without which they recognize no one as having made a credible profession of religion, or entitled to the privileges of the visible Church."

Our Baptist brethren constantly complain that the words baptize and baptism are retained in the common translation of the Bible. They claim

that these words should not be transferred, but translated, and rendered immerse and immersion. The Baptist Bible Society, in one of their first issues of the New Testament prepared for circulation, have adopted this rendering; "and this principle is carried out in all the translations circulated by that society in heathen languages. They eschew the very words baptize and baptism in all their translations." This is a fact deserving particular notice. We look upon it as a *concession* on the part of these Baptist brethren, that their cause is unsupported by the present translation of the Bible — that it does not justify or even favor immersion as the proper mode of baptism. Let us give this subject a fair trial. We take the Baptists on their own ground, examining the choicest words of their own selection.

Dr. Carson, their boasted champion, says, concerning *baptizo*, "My position is, THAT IT ALWAYS SIGNIFIES TO DIP, NEVER EXPRESSING ANY THING BUT MODE." A. Campbell says, "The *proper*, *grammatical*, or *literal* meaning of *baptizo*, is to *dip*, *immerse*, *merge*, *immerge*, *plunge*, all indicative of one and the same action." "We must

dip," he says, "only once, and the motion must be *backwards*," — not the most comely position at all times, especially for females. The "*Tunkers*," — *Dippers*, usually called *Dunkards* — "insist on an entire *triple* immersion, by a *forward* motion of the body." We have no sympathy for either of those motions. Neither Mr. Campbell's motion "*backwards*," nor the Tunker's "*forward* motion of the body," do always afford a sure safeguard to modesty. One definition of *plunging*, by Worcester, is "*to throw the body forward and the legs up as a horse.*" In the two motions under consideration, there is this difference in regard to legs: in the Tunker's plunge *forward* the *hind legs* are often thrown up backwards, but in Mr. Campbell's "dip backwards," the reverse is known to take place frequently.

Let us then, with the authority before us, select, and bring to the test, their owned avowed and favorite terms, immerse, dip, plunge, as the only proper meaning of baptism. We will take first, the one that seems highest in favor with Baptists generally — *Immersion*. This word is not found in our common Bible. Yet our Baptist

brethren, for many years, seem to have got along without it amazingly well; which ought to satisfy them. It is not a word of inspiration. It don't belong to the Hebrew, Greek, or English. It is a *Latin* term — *immersio*, with our letter *n* appended, to make it English. So after all, it is in the same condemnation with *baptizo*, not a translated, but a transferred term from the Latin, in which language the scriptures were not written. But this is not the worst; it is, I repeat it, a *bad* Latin term, never employed by the Holy Ghost. Nor was it, as already affirmed, employed by the learned translators of the Latin Bible of the third century. They did not believe, as immersionists do, that baptizo meant to immerse. Immersion is a term, we again aver, so notoriously uncertain in its application and import, so undeterminate, unfixed, unlimited, that it affords a very convenient cover for a very delusive proposition. A man may be immersed partially. Ezekiel (chap. 47) passing through the holy waters at different grades from the sanctuary, was first immersed "to the ankles;" then, "to the knees;" then, "to the loins;" and the fourth time, "the waters were

risen, waters to swim in, a river that could not be passed over." Moreover, to call the action of an immerser, in his baptism of an individual, a *total* immersion, is a mistake. The subject, whether man or woman, was previously *half* immersed, so that the official act was applicable to the other half only. Such a baptism, therefore, cannot be denominated, *officially*, a total immersion. Common sense and reason will not call it so.

But this is not all. "The putting away of the *filth* of THE FLESH," (1 Pet. iii, 21,) and Church members having "their BODIES washed with pure water," (Heb. x, 22,) are clearly indicated as a part of external baptism. Now let reason, common sense, and consistency determine which came nearest fulfilling these New Testament representations, the ancient Christians who, when they were baptized by immersion, were ALL BAPTIZED NAKED, or our modern Baptists, who go down into the water to be baptized, with more than the ordinary amount of clothing over them? See that provident, artful immerser, up to his middle in water, the ice perhaps several inches in thickness, having been broken to find beneath, the "watery

tomb where Jesus lay." See him snugly ensconced in his "baptismal pants," and along side, a stout looking man in double apparel, with the addition of a heavy overcoat closely covering the whole; or, mark that delicate female, if not well enveloped in "baptismal robes," yet, according to well authenticated testimony, when divested of her cold and icy encasement, she was disrobed of no less than "five dresses;" so that, as my informant, who assisted in the female department on the occasion, told me, the body was no more washed, or even touched by the water, than a diving fowl, enveloped within its own feathered costume, so compact and well adjusted, as to receive no detriment from the watery element from which it had just emerged. Is there a Baptist living whose BODY was washed with pure water at his baptism? His clothes might be; — but his body? No. When did any one put away the *filth* of the FLESH at this ordinance, as administered by immersion? — especially when wrapped all up like an Egyptian mummy, and then plunged into impure, muddy water, as *facts* abundantly testify.

As a general starting point, Baptist preachers

and writers, learned and unlearned, on this subject, thus begin their statement — "BAPTISM, from the Greek *baptizo*, of *Bapto*, I *dip* or *plunge*; to *dip*, *plunge*, or *immerse*." These English terms they consider synonymous, all having the same meaning in our language. But we think the inference is undeniable, from various considerations, that to *plunge* and to *dip* are not equivalent terms. For instance, Job ix, 31 — "Yet thou shalt *plunge* me in the ditch;" — Thou shalt DIP me in the ditch. As to the terms *dip* and *immerse*, were I a Baptist, I should prefer the former to the latter; because *dip* includes a double action — you dip any thing in, or under water, and immediately take it out again; and, therefore, describes most accurately the mode chosen by Baptists. But it is otherwise with the verb to *immerse*. "According to Dr. Johnson, it simply means 'to put under the water, to cover deep.' Unlike *dip*, it does not include nor imply the additional act of drawing out of the water that which has just before been put under it; but its signification is restricted to the single operation of covering, or 'sinking deep.' It

would be applicable to the mode which the Baptists adopt, *if* they simply put their proselytes *beneath* the water and left them there, if they merely 'buried them in baptism,' or, as they will have us read, 'buried with Christ *by immersion* into death,' and then abandon them 'to rise again' as best they could." And in reality, to this point they seem to be approximating with considerable activity.

In the Calcutta edition of the New Testament in the Armenian language, the Baptist editor has adopted a word, *Ungughmem*, for *baptizo*, which is literally translated by the English word *drown*. Both learned and unlearned, among the Armenians, themselves, with one voice, say, this word means *to drown*. Now suppose one of our new version Baptists in America were to use the corresponding word in English, instead of baptize, and get up in his pulpit and read thus: "Some say thou art *John the drowner*," &c., or, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, *drowning* them in the name," &c.; or, "He that believeth and is *drowned*, shall be saved;" or, "They went down into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch,

and he *drowned* him ;" who in that Church could be expected to preserve his gravity ? And what sober Christian person would not go away offended and indignant that sectarian passion should so blind men as to allow them to make a mocking stock of the blessed word of God ?

But this is not all, nor indeed the worst respecting this Calcutta edition of the New Testament. In Acts viii, 38, a change has been made, evidently with a view of strengthening the argument for immersion. The Baptist editor has put in a *verb*, found neither in the ancient Armenian, nor in the Moscow edition, of which this Calcutta edition professes to be a reprint, nor in the Greek, and has it thus, "They both descended, (and) *entered into the water*." The "*entered*," is wholly his own, and it really seems as if he was afraid to let the word of God speak for itself, because it is not so definite and decided on the subject of immersion as he would like to have it. But to pursue our train of remark a little further. As *dip* and *dipping* are preferable in the estimation of Dr. Carson and other Baptists, and synonymous with *immerse*, by all the rest, why do

they not constantly abide by this principle, and consistently substitute for baptize and Baptist, the word dip and Dipper? Why not change the phraseology of the English Bible, in accordance with their own avowed belief, and with unshrinking courage pursue the honest course of renouncing all ambiguous terms? "Were they thus to act, they would never more speak of baptisms, but of dippings; nor would they call themselves Baptists, but Dippers. No longer should we hear of Baptist Chapels, Baptist Unions, Baptist Anniversaries, Baptist Associations, Baptist Publications, Baptist Magazines, and Baptist Missions; but in their stead, we should have the true English and *far more* accurate phrases of Dipping Unions, Dipping Chapels, Dipping Anniversaries, Dipping Associations, Dipping Publications, Dipping Magazines, and Dipping Missions." What objection can those who adopt the opinion that baptism means to dip and nothing else, fairly urge against the change? Why this their avoidance of the only words which accurately describe their practice, if they did not know well that an "improved version" of the New Testament could not be

made rigid on their principles without exposing themselves to the loud laugh of impartial men, as well as rendering many portions of it either unintelligible or absurd. The trial can soon be made.

Let not the statement of their great Dr. Carson be forgotten. "The meaning of the word (baptize) is always the same, and *it always signifies to dip. It never has any other meaning.*" Now, dipping imports precisely a *partial* plunging. Swallows *dip* into a pond, but never *plunge.* From a number of instances in the Bible we may select the the following. Jonathan *dipped* the end of his rod in honeycomb — *Dip* thy morsel in vinegar — The feet of the priests *dipped* in the brim of the water.— He shall *dip* them, and the living bird, in the blood of the bird.— The priest shall *dip* his finger — He *dipt* his finger in the blood.— He shall *dip* his finger in oil.— Send Lazarus that he may *dip* the *tip* of his finger in water.— He that *dips* his hand with me in the dish.— All these places clearly denote only a partial immersion or *dipping.* What person of common sense, ever thinks of immersion, when

the extreme *tip* of the finger is *dipped* in water, in oil, in blood, or in any other liquid?

The following passages may serve as a fair specimen to test the principle where the words *dip* and *dipping* are substituted for *baptize* and *baptism*. "Know ye not that as many of us as were *dipped* into Jesus Christ, were *dipped* into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by *dipping* into death." "For by one Spirit are we all *dipped* into one body." "As many of you as have been *dipped* unto Christ, have put on Christ." "I indeed *dip* you with water unto repentance; but . . . he shall *dip* you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire." "John did *dip* in the wilderness, and preach the *dipping* of repentance." I have a *dipping* to be *dipped* with; and how am I straitened," &c. "Can ye . . . be *dipped* with the *dipping* that I am *dipped* with?" "And were all *dipped* unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." If the Israelites at this time, were *under* the cloud, then must they have been *dipped upwards*, or then did water, the *baptismal* element, *descend* on them from above. On the other clause of the sentence, the case is a plain

one. How were the Israelites *dipped* in the sea? If by *sea* the Apostle means the water, they did not pass *through* the sea at all, for Moses twice affirms, that they *passed over on dry land*, Exod. xiv, 22, 29. If his meaning is, they passed *along*, or *across the bed* of the sea, where the waters usually were, though at that time absent, he is right. But what language is this?—"to pass *through* dry land!" To *bury* the Egyptians in the waters of the Red Sea, on this occasion, there is no difficulty. But to dip and plunge the Israelites in the cloud *over* them, and the dry bed of the sea *beneath*, is quite another matter.

By the same process we will give the word *plunge* a similar trial. Here we have *good* English, instead of *bad* Latin. We feel at home in our mother tongue. To put the whole body under water, is to plunge it. Now for the proposition. —"Christian baptism is neither more nor less than *plunging* the whole body, in the name," &c. This is a plain proposition, divested of that sort of cloudiness, and convenient ambiguity by which the term immersion is recommended, which mystifies the uneducated mind, and hides the absurdity

of translations and actions, which would be instantly seen were the plain word of plunging or dipping put in its place. Having now a precise idea before us, that may be easily examined, let us try the experiment. It is maintained by immersionists, be it remembered, that the original Greek word baptize, whenever it occurs in Scripture, denotes plunging and dipping in the same sense as immersion.

Let us then try the word *plunge*, by applying it to the following passages. In the New Testament the verb *bapto* occurs three times: Luke xvi, 24 — Send Lazarus that he may *dip* the *tip* of his finger — that he may PLUNGE the tip of his finger. John xiii, 20 — A sop when I have *dipped* it — when I have PLUNGED it. Rev. xix, 13 — Clothed in a vesture *dipped* in blood — clothed in a vesture PLUNGED in blood.

The compound verb *embapto*, is used three times: Mark xiv, 30 — One of the twelve that *dippeth* — that PLUNGETH with me in the dish. Matt. xxvi, 23 — He that *dippeth* his hand — that PLUNGETH his hand with me in the dish. John xiii, 26 — A sop when I have *dipped* it —

when I have PLUNGED it: And when he had *dipped* the sop — when he had PLUNGED the sop. Is it not an outrage upon language to say *plunge* the *tip* of his finger? The notion, too, of Christ wearing a garment *plunged* in blood, is a stigma upon Christianity. So the *plunging* of two hands in the same dish at the same time, is it not a gross offence to decency?

Once more, let us try the noun *baptismos*, which occurs four times: Mark vii, 4, 8 — The *washing* of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and tables — the PLUNGING of cups, &c. Heb. vi, 2 — The doctrine of *baptisms* — doctrine of PLUNGINGS. Heb. ix, 10 — Meats and drinks, and divers *washings* — divers PLUNGINGS. If there was only *one mode* of baptism, and that by plunging, and so render it ONE PLUNGING, Eph. iv, 5, why does the same writer expressly say, that under the law there were *divers kinds* or *different sorts* of baptisms? for this is the proper rendering of the passage, as we have shown before. The *numerical* sense, the baptism of "a number of persons," is not the meaning of the passage. It is a palpable falsification of the word

of God. We know what we say when we make this affirmation.

One instance more, and we finish this train of thought and expression. In this case, as well as some others, we may fall into a little repetition, but as our object is not fame or worldly honor, we fear not to encounter the charge, if we can but give light and information on this long controverted and unsettled subject. The passage alluded to is, "John baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." Now read it according to the "new version:" John *plunged* with water; but ye shall be *plunged* with the Holy Ghost. Shocking abuse of language and principle! How contrary to fact, how offensive to the analogy of faith, the analogy of grammar, language, and to common sense.

The same will apply to Rom. vi, 4, 1 Cor. xii, 13, x, 2, &c.

We have seen how the promised baptism of the Holy Ghost was fulfilled on Pentecost. It was *poured* upon the disciples,— SHED upon, FELL upon, &c. This will exactly correspond with the action of John, in his mode of baptism. As John

poured water, *sheds* water, *lets fall* water upon you; so shall the Holy Ghost be *poured* upon, *shed* upon, *fall* upon you, &c. Here we have an exact similitude; there is nothing incongruous, indecent, or offensive. Depending on the New Testamant alone — or those writers under the immediate inspiration of the Holy Spirit who were his instruments in explaining spiritual things by spiritual words, we find them employing two words to express this similitude; one of which, *osper*, denotes a strict and exact similitude, likeness, or conformity. "The manner in which this *baptism*, of the Holy Ghost, was conferred or administered was not only distinct from *plunging*, but it was absolutely INCONSISTENT with that action — PLUNGING was an IMPOSSIBILITY in the administration of this baptism." In all the synonymous words employed to express the action of the Holy Spirit's baptism, there is not *one* that raises the idea of plunging, or even approximates to it. Yet they all refer to baptism. "The Apostles shall be BAPTIZED with the Holy Ghost." Here is the prediction. The Holy Ghost was POURED out upon them; — here is the accomplish-

ment. "The Holy Ghost *fell* on them *as on us at the beginning*," *i. e.*, at Pentecost. And now I would crave the indulgence of this honorable court and jury, if I should deviate a little from the prescribed course of debate, to introduce here, as the proper place, a very interesting historical fact respecting ancient practice, which goes to corroborate the sentiment just expressed, and likewise to indicate the apostolic practice in regard to the mode of baptism. There are yet in existence many ancient examples of baptism, pictorially represented on the doors, principally, of ancient Church edifices, all administered by POURING. In all these metaphorical allusions to the circumstances, the persons, plans, and action of baptism, not one instance of total submersion, or plunging, can be adduced. What could induce those Greek and Latin artists of the remotest antiquity, to adhere, so constantly and invariably, to the one simple action of *pouring*, in the numerous instances of baptism, unless they had felt themselves constrained to do so, from what they knew to be the existing practice, and by the unbroken conduct of all Christ's disciples to represent

baptism by this mode, as being THAT *to which* their Lord and Master had submitted. Did it not plainly show by the unvaried truth, unadulterated by ecclesiastical representations and pictorial allusions, that the attitude and action of the administrator of the ordinance, and of the person submitting to the rite, were constantly the same? It is true that in, perhaps, a majority of these representations, our Lord appears IN the water of Jordan up to his middle, yet John is NOT. Every one of the examples places John *on the bank or brink of the river*, but not one IN the water. From thence he administered baptism, POURING WATER on the head of the subject baptized. Some of these pictorial examples, in subsequent periods, represent the subject in the attitude of kneeling in an open space, while several royal persons, male and female, appear in large vessels called *baptisteries*, in a kneeling or squatting position, up to the waist in water; but in every instance the administrator POURS the baptismal element on the head of the person receiving the sacred rite of baptism. See Taylor's Apostolic Baptism, 189–226.

Mr. WATERMAN. — I beg the indulgence of your honor and the patience of the Jury, while I offer a few remarks in reply to some of the gentleman's, just at this point, while fresh in our recollection. He has adduced Heb. x, 22, "Having our bodies *washed* with pure water," as an allusion to Christian baptism. Can you conceive how the body is *washed* by sprinkling a little water on the head or face of a person standing in an erect posture? Is it not more consistent and rational to suppose that the washing of the body is better accomplished by immersion than by sprinkling? Reason and common sense must see a marked difference.

Again: is there not an incongruity — yea, a palpable contradiction, for a person standing before the pulpit, and receiving baptism by sprinkling, to turn round immediately, facing the congregation and professing before them, "I am buried with Christ in Baptism — I have my body washed with pure water?" How can a plain common sense congregation believe this, when they have witnessed a baptismal action quite the reverse. The contradiction appears so glaring, that it is

no wonder so many are found to repudiate the practice of sprinkling in baptism altogether.

Once more: the gentleman seems to have indulged his playful humor, in the ludicrous manner in which he has applied the words immerse, plunge, and dip. I need not repeat his manner. The picture, or rather the caricature, is yet vividly before you. But now, in my turn, taking him on his own ground, how do the following passages read according to his notion of the mode of baptism? — "In those days came John the *sprinkler*" — "There went out unto him Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were *sprinkled* of John in Jordan." "He came into all the country about Jordan preaching the *sprinkling* of repentance for the remission of sins." "Can ye be *sprinkled* with the *sprinkling* that I am *sprinkled* with." "He that believeth and is *sprinkled* shall be saved." "Unto what then were ye *sprinkled?* And they said, unto John's *sprinkling.*" "Then said Paul — John verily *sprinkled* with the *sprinkling* of repentance." "For by one Spirit are we all *sprinkled* into one body." "John also was

sprinkling in Enon because there was much water there." Enough; what need of going to Enon to find much water, if sprinkling was all that was necessary? And why did John baptize in Jordan — "in the river of Jordan," if sprinkling was all that was required? Why not administer the rite of baptism at any small rivulet, well, or fountain, or even have it brought in a vessel, as the gentleman seems to think, at the baptism of Cornelius in his own house? Surely these plain indications are against sprinkling and in favor of immersion.

Mr. SYMBOLICUS: — Gentlemen of the Jury: Let it not be forgotten that my opponent and all Baptists maintain that the original term, baptizo, means "to *dip*, and nothing but *dip*;" that it "means *mode*, and nothing else." If so, then there can be no misrepresentation, misuse, or "caricature," as the gentleman calls it, in the application I have made of their favorite terms, dip, plunge, immerse. If they read awkwardly or ludricrously, I cannot help it; and if they cannot help it neither, whose fault is it? But not only

so: you must at once see how unfair and unjust it is in him to aim to turn the tables on me by a similar retort: because he ought to know, as I have once and again plainly stated before you, that the term baptizo has no reference to *mode* at all: that it does not mean to immerse, to pour, or to sprinkle — not *mode* of any kind, but the *thing* — not the *shadow*, but the *substance*, and that is *purification*. If, indeed, we had asserted that baptizo meant to sprinkle or to pour, just as Baptists assert that it means to plunge, dip, or immerse, then we might be called upon to make good our theory, and with plausibility might the gentleman throw back upon us his ludicrous caricature, and likewise triumph as if he had obtained a victory, just because that is not established which was never maintained or affirmed. "We are well aware that in some passages the term baptizo could no more be translated to sprinkle than to dip, to pour than to plunge, and we maintain that the term is used simply and solely to designate a rite — an outward purification, emblematic of the internal purification, without any reference to the mode of its administration."

Is it not, therefore, an unworthy artifice when Baptists not only put us on grounds similar to their own, but likewise ask for evidence for the very point which is denied. The gentleman has certainly missed his mark, and his attempted retort is a total failure.

And as it respects the washing the body by sprinkling a little water upon it in ritual cleansing, the gentleman is equally mistaken. Has he forgotten the command of God to Moses, Num. viii, 6, 7, respecting the priestly consecration of the Levites? "Take the Levites . . . and cleanse them. And thus shalt thou do to cleanse them: *sprinkle water of purifying upon them.*" Here was a little water sprinkled on a human body to cleanse it. No mistake. The same divine authority says, Ezek. xxxvi, 25, "Then will *I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean.*" And let it ever be remembered what Christ said of the woman who broke the box of ointment, "and poured it on his head;" "She hath come forward to anoint my *body* to the burying." Here is the *body* anointed, when the precious liquid was *poured on the head* only.

The human head and face represent the whole man. The intelligent soul seems to look out from the face. Hence the practice so common and entirely satisfactory, to have a friend's likeness with no more than what is contained above the shoulders. It is the proper representation of the whole person; so our Master understood it, and we can't be far from the track when we have such a pattern to follow, whose "yoke is easy and whose burden is light."

But my opponent thinks it inconceivable, how a human body is washed by pouring or sprinkling a little water on the head or face, but in immersion, he thinks, there is no difficulty. But we in turn inquire, how is the body washed with all its clothes on? — with some half dozen suits one over another? Or what is more, with "baptismal pants," or "water-proof robes," enshrouding the body all over — and all done too, "by a single *dip* backwards" and up again in a second. Was there ever a human body *washed* in this way? We again aver, that the clothes might be — but the body? Never.

And as it respects John's going to Jordan and

to Enon to baptize, we have had enough of it. I did not say, or intend to say, he went to either of those places to sprinkle, though I fully believe he practiced that as the proper mode of baptism, as I have before shown. To dip, plunge or immerse, under all the circumstances, was impracticable, yea, impossible.

Just one word more about Enon: Its name imports a single spring; "*the fountain* of ON;" but probably flowed out in several small streams. Some Baptists will have it to be a river — "the river Jordan and the river Enon," says one, and no doubt this is the uncorrected impression of thousands who know no better. But if this place were so noted for the immersion of great multitudes, why has the memory of it so entirely perished? Where is there to be found an accurate geographical description of this far famed spot? The nature of the fountain called Enon — its locality — its magnitude — its properties, is a simple question not to be solved by verbiage, by imagination, or human devices. It is a question of pure geography. But it is unknown to our ablest Geographers, to our most adventurous and

observing travelers, to our most inquisitive men. European travelers have explored the Jordan from the lake of Tiberias to the Dead Sea, with great assiduity; but who of them all gives the least hint of such a spring? Is it not a great wonder, that a body of water so considerable as Baptists make out, should continue unknown; notwithstanding hundreds of travelers have been within a short distance of it? "The French at the time of Napoleon's expedition into Syria, had a *corps of horse* at Beth Shen; and roamed the country down the Jordan, particularly exploring it on the west. Have they dropped the smallest hint of a discovery so acceptable, especially for cavalry?

Not a single word of any fountain, river, stream, or any thing else, answering the Baptist Enon. Our whole information concerning this spring rests on the authority of Eusebius, repeated by Jerome, who says, in a few words, "it was eight miles from Scythopolis, south, between Salim and the Jordan." This is the whole that appears in Calmet, Kitto, and all other able Bibliographers, who, of this "thundering fountain,"—this "river

Enon," as held and described by Baptists, *knew absolutely nothing*. Against these mere phantoms of Baptist ingenuity and fancy, we most solemnly protest. We deny, in express terms, that there is now, or ever was, such a place according to the character attributed to it by the Baptists. And I can almost as soon believe that John dipped or plunged people in the moon, as that he immersed them in Enon. Whatever the mode might be, it was not immersion. How could it be ?

And now, Gentlemen of the Jury, having finished my Scriptural argument on the subject under consideration, I crave your patient attention while I adduce some very prominent and serious objections to immersion as a mode of baptism ; — objections which ought to be duly considered by all intelligent candidates for that solemn ordinance. And first :—

Imagination. Few are aware how much imagination has to do with this subject, and how much impression has been made on the minds of the uninformed by mere sound and show. The person has heard so much about " going down into the water," " liquid grave," " buried with Christ

in baptism," &c, that he fancies some analogy between baptism and Christ's burial. Take the following as a fac-simile, or fair exemplification, which will apply to scores and hundreds of similar cases. A young lady thus writes:—

"As I saw the young ladies standing at the side of the water, I thought to myself that they looked to me just like the shining ones in the pictures of Pilgrims' Progress that stood upon the brink of the river; and then I thought how beautiful it must have been to see so many as John baptized, all dressed in lily-white robes, like angels in heaven, by the river Jordan, and the river Enon,— and what a grand sight it must have been on the day of Pentecost! I never in my life saw the path of duty to be baptized so plain as I did then; and I was so convinced by that sweet sight that I thought I could stand back no longer."— *Confessions of a Convert, pp.* 162, 163.

"I can speak, sir, from experience," she continues, "of the benefits of baptism. When I was baptized, I *felt* that I was buried with my Saviour. I shall never forget that season. All your

arguments, sir, and all the arguments in the world, will never turn me. I would put my experience against them all." There it is. The matter is settled by mere imagination, without proof or argument. You might as well try to reason with a tempest.

"The best way to make a woman consent to be immersed as a Baptist, is to tell her that she is afraid to go into the water, that immersion is a heavy cross she does not like to bear, and that if she truly loved the Saviour, she would be willing to take up the cross, and be buried with him in his 'liquid grave.' She is conscious of a strong reluctance: her femenine delicacy revolts at the idea of being dipped in a pond or a river before the gazing and searching eyes of a large miscellaneous assembly: she feels there is truth in what they tell her; that she is indeed afraid; that she does not like to bear a cross so painful: she becomes convinced that those who take up that cross must have much love to Christ: and at last, agitated, perplexed, and distressed, she resolves on submitting to the operation. She goes down into the water, and under it; she comes up out

of the water, and *feels* better, thinking that she has crucified her sins, when the truth is, she has crucified nothing but her sense of propriety."

Another objection is, that it is *indelicate* and often *ludicrous*. It violates a natural and healthful sense of propriety, for females, especially, to expose themselves in water, with and before the other sex. We are aware that the mention of this objection is taken with offence. We cannot help it. It is an old established maxim that, "truth may be blamed, but cannot be shamed." Though modesty forbids the statement of this objection in all its force, yet it is one which ought to be urged in self-defence against the ridicule, the sarcasm, proscription, and denunciation, so lavishly thrown upon us by immersionists, with few exceptions, from every quarter. As we have before remarked, it is an uncontradicted *fact*, that baptism, in the early days of immersion, was administered to men, women, and children, naked as Adam and Eve before the fall. The practice was pleaded for and insisted upon, because it was thought to be apostolic. Who does not see that, to be consistent, our Baptist friends ought to

observe a literal conformity to the usage of the ancient Church, and baptize their converts naked, or cease to adduce ancient usage as a triumphant argument against us.

But why go so far back as the ancient customs of the Church? Modern practice affords abundant evidence of the truth of our objection. A few *facts*, from many of like character, must suffice. "One of these," says an eye witness, "was the shrill scream of a woman, as she felt herself going under the water. Another was the struggling of a young person, who succeeded in wrenching herself from the minister's grasp, and fell with a loud splash into the baptistery. More than once," he continues, "I recollected that persons *fainted* in the water; and I distinctly retain the image of the ghastly and death-like countenance of a woman as her head hung back, wet and motionless, over the arm of the person who dragged her into the vestry. At another time, in an oblivious moment, I actually burst out into a loud laugh . . . to see Mr. B., who was a short, stiff, portly man, lose his balance and his footing, while attempting to immerse a man twice his own bulk,

and himself fall sideways, with no small stir and splutter, into the water."— *Convert pp.* 44, 45.

I appeal to the more sober and candid of our Baptist brethren themselves, if they have not witnessed young ladies all "dressed in lily-white robes," presently emerging from the water with those lily-white robes deeply soiled by the muddy element, and closely clinging to their bodies, rendering the movement of their limbs difficult and ungainly, and leaving a stream of the sacred element in their train. On occasions of this kind, there have occurred scenes so revolting that modesty has turned away offended, and pious Baptists themselves have been heard to express their regrets and mortified feelings. On a recent occasion there was seen one lady going down into the water, in a half bending position, assiduously employed in pressing down her floating apparel, on this side and on that; while another, more provident, has her dress well *leaded* down with a pound of shot encircling the lower border, which succeeds admirably in making her drapery behave. But with all the contrivances and arrangements, of modern times, baptism by *immersion* is not a

decent practice; there is not an intelligent, reflecting female, perhaps, who submits to it, without a great previous struggle with her delicacy. And this circumstance, as well as other considerations, suggest the improbability, that a religion like the Christian, so scupulously delicate, should have enjoined the immersion of women by men, and in the presence of men. The invention of baptisteries, and separate rooms for women, and changes of garments and other auxiliaries of this practice, came into use, because they were found necessary to decency. But there could be no such conveniences in Apostolic days; and consequently we read of none. The simple practice of pouring or sprinkling, would require none. At all times and under all circumstarces, they could perform the rite without any such auxiliaries. Let all stand up and be baptized like Paul, and no baptisteries will be needed. The following is from an eye witness of the most veritable character, though not a member of any Church. Col. B. witnessed a baptismal scene in the vicinity of B—— town, which in substance, if not *verbatim*, is as follows: —

The day was rainy. The discolored rills were descending from the clay banks into the ravine below, where was a reservoir selected for the baptismal service. Just opposite, on the bluff above, was a slaughter-house, where a number of swine had been butchered. A large portion of the offal had, by some means, found a place of repose in this reservoir. As usual, on such occasions, rain or shine, a number of persons were present—some on horseback. And as they rode round for greater convenience, passing the lower extremity of the reservoir, the long and quiet repose of this precious deposit became disturbed as they were entangled and dragged up, dangling about the horse's feet. The odor of the whole place was deeply offensive, so much so, that Dr. H., who rode beside my informant, a celebrated physician, but a stern infidel, the keeper also of a large pack of hounds, profanely swore, that no dog of his should be allowed to go into such a place. Presently the immerser, Elder C., and his convert, Mr. P., moved slowly and cautiously into the putrid element, which bubbled up around them as they progressed. And to the amazement and disgust

of many, there were seen portions of this same odious deposit rise to the surface in their rear!

And here in this place, where, if anywhere, we ought to expect to find decency and purity, as well as solemnity and order, was this man immersed. But could it be said that his body was "*washed with pure water?*" No indeed: it looks more like an insult, though not intended, to high Heaven, whose nature is all holiness, and whose religious institutions are all indicative of the same character. But a *burial*, and not *purity*, was the object sought for here, and in all such cases; the *quality* of the element is no matter of consequence; and whether impure and offensive, or otherwise, it makes no difference, so the body can find a "liquid grave." In the case before us, I know this man well, I see him often; he has all the signs of an ardent votary of Bacchus; and the elder — both Campbellites — has forsaken the pulpit for the more consistent and lucrative practice at the bar.

The following account is from the same reliable person who was present on the occasion. Elder C., an aged veteran of the Reformation fraternity,

was baptizing some four or five persons at or near the same place as above, among whom was a stout, heavy, unwieldy African. Besides the common attendants, there were present about one hundred students from the Catholic literary institution, who stood at a short distance, occupying a position a little elevated above where the baptism was about to take place. The service commenced, and progressed until it came to the African's turn, which was the last. He was submerged, and immediately arose with not a small portion of the muddy substratum from below cleaving to him. A colored brother present, adverting to this circumstance, exclaimed, in a half-suppressed tone, "*Eh! wonder why da dip nigger deeper dan white folk for!*" At this, the whole congregation lost its gravity, and the college boys, as by a concerted signal, cried at the top of their voices, with their hats whirling around their heads, "*Hurra for Andrew Jackson! Hurra for Andrew Jackson!! Hurra for Andrew Jackson!!!*" The confusion having somewhat subsided, the preacher addressed them slowly and significantly, "Why boys, can't you behave

yourselves?" Such are the irregularities, disorders, and unseemly circumstances that oft attend baptismal scenes by immersion.

I can assure you, Gentlemen of the Jury, it affords me no pleasure to exhibit these ludicrous transactions before you; and I can conscientiously declare, that it is not done to stigmatize or offend our Baptist friends. The more intelligent and pious among them, I know, do not endorse such proceedings. They say they *can't help it*, and would gladly have such things dispensed with, and complain of unkindness in us for bringing them up and exposing them to public notice. But, as before observed, we are measurably compelled to this course in self-defence. Must we patiently endure every onset, every torrent of abuse and ridicule, of sarcasm and proscription, thundering from all quarters against us, and not open our mouths? Facts are stubborn things. They do not lie, and be it known to all the world, that while immersion is practiced, such things will happen, as collaterally connected with it. It is unavoidable. And were all the comical, ludicrous, offensive cases collected and published, without

varnish, note, or comment, it would make a volume of no ordinary size, while at the same time, the outcry of persecution, from our Baptist friends, would be heard from Dan to Beersheba against the authors and publishers of such a work. But the simple, decent, inoffensive practice of sprinkling or pouring in baptism, is liable to no such abuses and objections.

Another serious objection to immersion, is its *unaccommodating* character; it does not harmonize with the simplicity of the gospel. "Christianity is a universal system. It is designed for the world. Each of its doctrines, and promises, and injunctions, and institutions, is perfectly fitted to men of every clime, character, and condition. One of the clearest evidences of the divine origin of Christianity is, the exact and entire adaptation of its regulations and requirements to every community, class, and creature under heaven — the shivering Icelander and the sun-burnt Moor; men of all climes, the Greek, the Jew, Barbarian, Scythian, bond or free, whether they dwell in the city or the wilderness, amidst the sands of the desert or the springs of the valley, it ordains no

service, and requires no observance which may not be readily performed. Its ritual is simple, not severe — suited not to the healthy and robust alone, but also to the delicate woman, and the man of gray hairs." Well might our Saviour say, "My yoke is easy and my burden is light."

There is one interesting peculiarity belonging to the baptismal rite as practiced in the primitive age. It could be administered in any place, or at any time. In the language of an intelligent writer, "Wherever the Apostles preached, then and there they could baptize. In the city or in the desert, the house or the prison, it was equally and always easy. There was no difficulty, no delay, no exemption. Age caused no hesitation; health constituted no barrier. Friends were not alarmed; physicians were not consulted. The gloom of midnight was as favorable for its performance as the brightness of noon. Families could observe the rite on the very first hour of their hearing the gospel; and thousands, apparently without difficulty, on the very day, and probably in the very place of their conviction." All this appears to agree well with the general adaptation of Chris-

tianity to man's changing circumstances; and with the simple and easy method of sprinkling in baptism; but to immersion, with all its cumbrous, inconvenient, collateral circumstances, it does not apply. Who can harmonize the views and practice of immersionists, with either the genius of the gospel, or the practice of the primitive age?

The last objection, and one of no small concern, we have to immersion is, that it is not only cumbrous and inconvenient, but likewise *dangerous to health and life.* The infirm health of the officiating minister, and the feeble state of the persons to be immersed, forbid the exposure of themselves in this way. The extreme cold winter season is against it. All the northern and southern parts of the globe, where rivers and pools are locked up with impenetrable ice and snow for some nine months in the year, speak loudly against immersion, as impracticable and impossible. On a sick bed and *in extremis*, there are a multitude of cases in which it would cost life. The following well authenticated facts will speak for themselves:

"Amongst the attendants at our chapel," says the intelligent anonymous writer before alluded

to, "there were two very intelligent and devout young ladies, who had three years before left the Established Church, in which they were brought up, because they could not profit by the preaching which they heard there. . . . Their health was extremely delicate; and by most they were considered as destined to an early grave. One of them suffered from an affection of the spine, and serious apprehensions were entertained that consumption had commenced its fatal course in the other. By the perusal of books in favor of immersion, with which they had been copiously supplied, together with the earnest persuasions of Mr. B., the sisters were brought to believe that it became them in this way to profess the gospel. As their diffidence, however, amounted almost to a disease, and they secluded themselves from society, they suffered a long and severe mental conflict, before they could so far control their feelings as to submit to a ceremonial which would expose them to what they deemed a most distressing publicity. But they were still more powerfully influenced by a fear that the service, in their case, might prove as perilous as it was painful. Yet strong as these

objections seemed, they had at length been silenced, partly by the confident manner in which they were assured by our minister that God would preserve them from all evil, in the observance of his own ordinance, but principally by the conviction that this was a part of the cross which the Christian was commanded to carry. Although, therefore, their repugnance and apprehensions remained, a sense of duty preponderated.

But their feelings were spared, and their consciences satisfied, by a striking, though, I believe, by no means, a singular occurrence. About a month prior to their decision, a baptismal service had been performed at a small town a few miles from us; and amongst the immersed there was a young woman, at the time in apparently sound health, who caught a severe cold in the service, which speedily ran to a fever, delirium, and death. The cause was so evident, and the whole case so clear, that even the most contracted Baptists in our congregation — and there were those who seemed to think that God would actually work a miracle to counteract what, in some constitutions, would be the certain consequence of

immersion — were confounded; whilst others confessed that it was a most mysterious providence.

This circumstance came to the ears of the two sisters, and it affected them deeply. Their first step was to send for Mr. B.; but as he still assured them of their safety, without assigning, as they thought, any reason for such assurance, or producing a divine warrant to that effect, they were not satisfied; and therefore they wisely resolved to do what they now perceived ought to have been done before, viz: to consult their medical attendant on the subject. His judgment was very strong. He said it would be perilous in the extreme, and that he knew scarcely any cause more calculated to quicken disease and accelerate death. This decided them — convinced that He who desireth mercy and not sacrifice, could not require them in such a way to hazard their lives, they wisely declined the service. *Convert, pp.* 31–33.

The following, taken from a little work, entitled "*Immersion not Christian Baptism*," first published in the "*New England Puritan*," and quoted by Dr. Peters, on Baptism, (p. 127,) may

stand as the representative of a thousand similar facts:

"A young man was propounded for admission to one of our Churches. But he had been educated to regard immersion as the only mode of baptism. Nearly all his relatives were of that belief. The question was naturally proposed, why he should leave the sect in which he had received all his early impressions, and join a Pedo-baptist Church. He simply replied, '*My Mother believed in immersion; therefore, I do not.*' On being questioned in respect to this strange reason, he responded to the clergyman who raised the question, and said, 'You knew my mother — do you believe she was a Christian?' 'I do not question her piety,' was the reply; 'I believe she is now in heaven.' 'Well, sir,' said the young man, 'years before my mother's death, she hoped she was a Christian. She desired to profess Christ before men, to join the people of God, and meet the Saviour at his table. She was in feeble health. Her physician told her that immersion would cost her her life. But her physician was not a friend to immersion, and it was thought that his views

might influence his judgment. A physician was sent for whose views of baptism harmonized with my mother's. His opinion was expressed in these words: '*If you go into the water you must die.*' This settled the case. To profess and obey Christ was impossible, as immersion alone was baptism to my mother. And thus, for a long and dark period, she walked alone, till God called her to his table above. I do not believe such a mode belongs to the gospel, and I choose to unite myself to a Church in which the feeble, the decrepit, the infirm, the sick and the dying, if their hearts be right, may find access below to the fold of Christ."

A few more facts, Gentlemen of the Jury, and then, on my part, your patience shall be relieved. I have said that baptism by immersion was cumbrous and inconvenient. This, I think, has been made manifest, and to every unbiased person satisfactory. The following happened in a neighborhood not far distant. The individual was in a declining state, and knew he must die. He sought the Saviour, and ere long, obtained a "good hope through grace." He wished to become united to

the people of God, by owning Christ before men. He was strongly prejudiced in favor of immersion. He was too far gone to attend church, or to go down into the water. The door of the Baptist church, contrary to former usage, was opened at his own house, and he was, in some way, received. But how was he to be baptized? Modern invention could readily provide a bathing trough of tin or sheet-iron. Being replenished with "much water," it was made to stand some hours in the sun's rays, until, by the aid of a little warm water from the boiler, it was made quite accommodating to the sick man. It was placed along side of his bed, and he put into it up to his waist;—thus, being previously half immersed, he was baptized. The minister stood outside — they did not both go down into the water like Philip and the Eunuch — and then put the other half under water by "one dip backwards," and thus the man found a "liquid grave," and was, after this strange manner, declared to be "buried with Christ in baptism," though evidently not in "Jordan's holy river," nor was the body "*washed with pure water.*" Though in a private house, and a

large portion of the congregation, with the wife and daughter, being Pedo-baptists, yet the immerser had not the prudence or courtesy, to withhold the usual tirade on baptism, proscribing all who did not adopt and practice immersion as the only proper mode. Philip and the Eunuch going both down into the water, was urged in favor of his scheme with great fervor and assurance. And yet to see him presently taking his stand outside a bathing machine, and dip backwards the head and shoulders of a human body, the lower extremeties being already immersed, where is the analogy, or anything like a parallel between such an anomoly and the baptism of the Eunuch, or between immersion and the burial of dead bodies? Do we bury the dead by first setting them upright in the grave, and then tilt them backwards to a horizontal position, and say they are buried?

The person whose case is above related, very soon became dissatisfied with his ecclesiastical relation. Finding that he, and his pious Presbyterian companion, could not be allowed to commune together, which he greatly desired before his death, he determined to change his Church

relation. This I had from his own mouth, and the desired event would soon have been accomplished had it not been for the intervention of death, which happened a few days afterwards.

Shortly after the foregoing, an aged widow lady, being near her latter end, was attended by this same religious fraternity. She professed to them her Christian experience and hope. They pronounced her converted, and gladly would they have received her into their Church. But her age and infirmity, her low and helpless condition, rendered it impossible for her to be dipped even in a trough by her bed side, much less in a river or pond. And so the old lady died without the pale of the visible kingdom of Christ, debarred from entering there by the severity, unsuitableness, and unaccomodating nature of one of his own institutions! No such obstacles occur, however, in the practice of Pedo-baptists. And more tender, interesting, affecting scenes I never witnessed, and can never forget, than in several instances, where the new-born soul, feeble and helpless, but joyful and resigned, reclining on the pillow of death received "the seal of our God in

their foreheads." By the sacred rite of baptism they were "born of water," and so "entered the kingdom of God" below, and being born of "the Spirit," they entered, through the gate of death, the kingdom of God above. Two brief facts more, Gentlemen of the Jury, and I am done.

The Mormons and Baptists, in whatever else they may differ, harmonize exactly on the mode of baptism. Both believe in immersion. This is the uniform practice of both; and, it is presumed, for the same reasons. Both are liable to the same exposures and casualties. In this respect, therefore, there is no difference. Our reference is as good in the one case as the other. The Christian Observer, (December 22, '49) quoting from the *Shrewsbury Journal*, (England,) gives us the following fact. "Thomas Lloyd, Mormon, took Ann Griffiths, of *Castle Forgate*, down the river near the *Horse Boat*, *Underdale*, to immerse her; only four or five persons were present. Returning after immersing her, his foot slipped, and both plunged into water six feet deep. The woman was rescued by James Bishop. The man was drowned."

A similar case is recorded in the New York Observer, March 4, '52. "A Mormon fanatic, named Barnes, insisting on baptizing two new converts, both young females, in the *Trent, at Ryefields, near Buston*, was, on entering the river, which was much swollen, at once carried off his legs and drowned."

Here were two immersers drowned, while their converts escaped a "liquid grave." But if all the cases of the one and of the other were faithfully registered, I have little doubt but it would strike the unsuspicious, who have thought but little on the subject, with amazement, and far transcend the expectation of incredulity itself. But none of these charges and complaints can ever be tabled against Pedo-baptists.

I thank your honor, Judge, and you, Gentlemen of the Jury, for your attention, your patience, and forbearance, manifested during the time and progress of this discussion.

MR. WATERMAN: — Gentlemen of the Jury: Though by rule, it is my right to open and close in this discussion, yet I am by no means tenacious of

the last word. And I rise now, not to prolong debate, or enter into any new argument, but briefly to notice the objections against immersion, raised by the gentleman, as being cumbrous and inconvenient, endangering life and health, and all that. In regard to the facts he has adduced, whether authentic or not, I have only to say, that all the difficulties in respect to baptism abroad, in rivers and pools, as well as exposure to inclement weather, can be avoided by the building of a *baptistery*, such as the ancient Churches had, where the hazard of cold water becomes unnecessary, and the feeble and infirm may be accommodated with baths adapted in temperature to their state and condition. If this were the case, we should hear no more of such casualties and appalling scenes as the gentleman has conjured up, and spread before you. Only let the experiment be made, and if it do not work well, then it will be time enough to search after dark and forbidding scenes, which, to say the least of them, are of doubtful authority. But as I said, I did not intend to prolong debate, and therefore I close, with my hearty thanks to this honorable

Court and Jury, as the gentleman has done, and for similar reasons which he has expressed.

Mr. Symbolicus: — I hope to be indulged a moment, while I make a few additional remarks to those already made, respecting *baptisteries*, occasioned by the remarks just made, respecting their convenience and utility. What we incidentally said of them in the progress of this debate, I had thought sufficient. But what I have now to say, in further remarks about them, shall be as brief as possible.

In the first place, I object to the sufficiency or consistency of what the gentleman has said, on the ground that the practice of building *baptisteries* is well known to be an innovation upon the more ancient usage of the Church. The Apostles, it seems, had no use for them. Ananias baptizing Saul of Tarsus *standing*, did not need one. Such a contrivance they never thought of. In what part of the New Testament do we find any thing concerning them? What right have we to depart from apostolic usage? May we not justly charge our Baptist friends with a departure

from the simplicity and significancy of baptism by the use of pure and living or running water, as the rite was performed in the days of the Apostles?

Again: the gentleman says, let the experiment be made, and if it does not work well, then it will be time enough to complain, &c. *Work well!* The experiment has been made centuries and centuries ago; and have we not seen how it worked then? "It is notorious," says Professor Stuart, "and admits of no contradiction, that baptism, in those days of immersion, was administered to men, women, and children, *in puris naturalibus*, naked as Adam and Eve before the fall. The most tender, modest, and delicate females, young or old, could obtain no exception, where immersion must be practiced." And as priests, and priests only, in any common case, could administer the rite, it is no wonder that the scandal of the thing became notorious. No wonder, as before observed, to hear Athenasius complain that in his times there were "scandalous occurrences in the baptistery." In vain did the Churches seek to avoid the reproach of this scandalous practice, by building a separate *baptistery* for females, or by baptizing them

separately. Work well indeed! It worked the other way, and increased to such a degree, that the Churches were forced at length into a proper sense of decency, and burst asunder the bands of superstition by a change of practice in the administration of the sacred rite of baptism.

In regard to the character, antiquity, and use of baptisteries, a very brief account must suffice. Authors are not agreed about the time when the first baptisteries were built. All agree, however, that the first were like the manners and customs of the people, simple, and merely for use, and in the end, they rose to as high a degree of elegant superstition as enthusiasm could invent. "A baptistery in the fourth century," says Robinson, the Baptist historian, "was an octagon building, with a cupola roof resembling the dome of a cathedral, adjacent to a church, but no part of it. All the middle part of the building, was one large hall, capable of containing a great multitude of people. The sides were parted off, and divided into rooms; and in some, rooms were added outside, in the fashion of cloisters. In the midst of the great hall was an octagon bath, which, strictly

speaking, was the *baptistery*, and from which the whole building derived its name. Some had been natural rivulets before the building had been erected over them, and the pool was contrived to retain water sufficient for dipping, and to discharge the rest. Others were supplied by pipes; and where the baptism was performed on naked subjects, (as from the fourth to the sixteenth century was the common practice,) the water was conveyed into one or more of the side rooms, that the baptism of the women might be performed apart from that of the men." At Rome, we are told, there were many baptisteries. Some are yet standing; while the memory of others is preserved in records and monumental fragments, and engraved illustrations.

The chapel of the baptistery in the catecomb of *Pontianus*, out of the gate *Portese* at *Rome*, is a subject of great interest, and occupies the first place among the baptisteries, as being the most simple, and perhaps the most ancient of those monuments. It is a subterannean recess, and was appropriated to the administration of baptisms, in the first ages of Christianity, because of the open,

untiring, cruel persecution of the enemy which was in full operation in A. D., 64. It was discovered in 1687. There is still seen the basin cut in the rock, and the spring still flows whence issued the water which served to administer baptism. In that basin of running water stood the converts from heathenism, where they renounced their idols; while the sacred name and rite consecrated their transition to a renewed life. This may then be considered one of the first baptisteries of the Christians. It may justly be dated before the latter end of the first century. And of equal date with the conversion of this baptistery into a catecomb. It was a baptistery before it was a sepulchre. For a more full account of this interesting subject, see Taylor's Apostolic Baptism, pages 220–226. On examination of the plan he says, "a small recess is observed of about two feet in depth and width, just sufficient to hold *one person only;* and there undoubtedly stood the person who administered the ordinance. It could serve for no other use: and evidently was cut out for that purpose. It follows that baptism was NOT administered by

plunging, but as the accompanying picture bears testimony, by *pouring* on the head of the convert. This baptistery then, agrees with *every instance known*, in witnessing that the administrator did not enter the water; and so far the conclusion is established on the rock itself."

"I have choson this picture," says the same author, "of ancient baptism, because, as an example, it speaks for itself beyond controversy; because it agrees with all other ancient representations known; because the action of the baptizer is clearly that of pouring; and *because it is much older than any copies of the gospel now in use.* It is two centuries older than those venerable manuscripts, the Alexandrian and Vatican copies, and is one of the earliest possible monuments of Christianity that can be now remaining."

If, therefore, our opposing brethren will resort to the ancient usage of the Church in support of immersion, we are ready to meet them there. Let them show, if they can, one instance of immersion, in all the pictorial representations now in existence — and there are many of them — they can find a dozen in Taylor's "Apostolic Baptism,"

and as he says, "the number might be made up to fifty"— and not one can they find but what is positively against them. Let them travel further forward, until they do find immersion as the general practice,— and what then? Why, there they find connected with it, and inseparable from it, naked subjects, men, women, and children, as we have noticed once and again,— baptized naked as they were born. Let them take the whole together, and welcome, or let them be silent, and ever hereafter hold their peace,— never adducing any more such base corruption and gross departure from apostolic practice in support of their tottering cause. Nor does the Bible sustain them;— not an instance can be found in all the "divers baptisms" of the Old Testament, of one person dipping or plunging another. It is not only unsupported by *fact*, or by *precept*, but all Jewish analogy is against it. Nor is there, when properly considered, we again aver, a fact, a circumstance, a word, an incident, or even a hint in the New Testament, that goes to *prove* immersion. The most is mere conjecture or probability. It can't be proved, by the proper evidence, that

Christ was immersed, or that any of the Apostles were, or that any other person was ever so baptized, as the only exclusive method, or door of entrance into the visible kingdom of God. Let us have the proof,—the proper evidence, that immersion is the scriptural mode of baptism, that it was the Apostolic practice, and then, and not till then, will we all obey without hesitation. We have investigated this subject for more than forty years, and it is our honest confirmed belief, that immersionist errors are widely and extensively mischievous. They are the basis of one of the greatest and most pernicious schisms in the Church that has ever occurred. We mean no offence, we design to cast no reproach upon our Baptist brethren, many of whom we know to be highly intelligent, respectable, and pious: yet, when viewing them in the mildest light possible, we consider them schismatics. They divide the Church of Christ: they exclude their more correct and orderly brethren from the Lord's table, as unbaptized. They are not satisfied with being a *branch* of the Church of Christ, but claim to be Christ's *only* Church in this wide

world. With such arrogant claims, such lofty pretensions, such positive assurance of the correctness of their exclusive ecclesiastical position, ought they not to produce the most positive, direct, unequivocal testimony from Heaven of the soundness of their claims? We solemnly protest against their exclusive position, and aver, from the clearest conviction, that they have not, never had, and cannot, in all time to come, produce a "Thus saith the Lord," for the dipping, plunging, or immersing of a single individual in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as essential to a valid baptism — as the only method of entering the visible Church of the living God. I add no more, but with all confidence and cheerfulness, submit the cause of my clients to this enlightened jury.

The Judge then addressed the Jury as follows:

GENTLEMEN OF THE JURY: — A case of no small importance is now before you, for your decision. The subject has been thoroughly investigated, both for and against the parties implicated. The case does not appear to be a complicated one. And all the points involved being reduced to a

small compass, it will require but a brief period to embrace the remarks which it devolves on me to give you in charge.

It has been affirmed in behalf of the prosecution, that the original term *baptizo* means to immerse, to dip, or plunge, *exclusively*, that it means *mode* and nothing else, and that when Christ gave command to baptize, it was *explicit*, to be performed by a total submersion of the subject under the water, and this action is essential to a valid baptism. This is strongly affirmed, though in the absence of direct evidence. On the other side, it is argued that baptizo does not mean *mode* of any specific character; that it does not refer to the shadow, but to the substance — to the *thing* itself, and that is *purification*, called "the washing of regeneration."

It has been shown, I think, very clearly, that there are two kinds of baptism, the one *external*, "with water," and the other *internal*, "with the Holy Ghost," the external being the shadow, the outward sign or representative of the internal baptism of the Holy Spirit. Now, if you are satisfied of this fact, and that Christ, the divine legislator, has given no *specific* command as to

the *outward mode* of performing the initiatory rite of baptism, then are you bound to render your verdict in favor of the defendants. Moreover, if you are satisfied that the following passages in which the *original* word for baptize, and baptism, is used, cannot admit of immerse and immersion, as the proper rendering, then you are bound to come to the same conclusion. The passages I allude to, and which have been fully exhibited before you, are, Mark vii, 4; Luke xi, 38; Acts i, 5; 1 Cor. x, 2; xii, 13. As it respects the baptisms at Jordan, at Enon, at the house of Cornelius, at Philippi, Damascus, in the Desert, and of the three thousand at Jerusalem, they have all been dwelt upon before you, and every thing said that was necessary. The case at Damascus is very strong in favor of one of the accused, Ananias; it seems a very plain case, amounting almost to moral certainty, that, whatever the mode might be, Paul was not baptized by immersion. As for Rom. vi, 4–13, and Col. ii, 11–13, they have been elaborately and lucidly investigated, with more pains and force than usual.

But if all the arguments of the gentlemen on

both sides should be found, on examination, to be defective, as to the establishment of one particular mode of baptism, exclusive of all others, it will remain to be inquired, which is the most probable. "Many things can be proved to be probable, which cannot be proved to be true; and the higher degree of probability, in cases where certainty cannot be attained, has all the practical importance of certainty itself." Where truth cannot be attained with certainty, we are bound to be governed by probabilities. In such cases, strong probabilities are as valid principles of action as truth itself. You are, therefore, to judge on which side of the present case, the greatest degree of probability lies. "The highest degree of probability is next to certainty, and does not differ from it to any appreciable extent. So far as all practical purposes are concerned, it does not differ from certainty at all." If this theory be correct, then it follows, that the mode which is highly probable ought to be adopted in preference to modes which are in a less degree probable, and, still more in preference to those which are in no degree probable.

You will, therefore, Gentlemen of the Jury, give due consideration to the arguments adduced on both sides, and if they fall short of establishing the conclusion deduced from them as certain, and establish it as probable, then the degree of probability which they establish, will require to be estimated. "If the probability established, is of a high degree, the conclusion will possess a proportionably high value. But if the degree of probability is indefinitely high, the conclusion will be an indefinitely near approximation to certainty, and will not be inferior to certainty in a practical point of view." Your verdict will be looked for with great interest and high expectation.

The Jury, after a brief retirement, returned with the following verdict:

We, the Jury, are of the opinion, unanimously, that the persons implicated in this trial, for dipping and plunging men and women under water in baptism, are — NOT GUILTY.

At this, the people in attendance sent up a loud shout, with a hearty response of — AMEN, and the Court adjourned *sine die*.

CONTENTS.

	Page
The Court organized,	7
The Charge,	7
Mr. Waterman's argument,	8
Main question — the turning point,	11
Figurative use of baptism,	12
Places selected — Jordan and Enon,	15, 17
Philip and the Eunuch,	18
Response by Mr. Symbolicus,	20
Ancient usage — naked subjects,	21
Latin translation — Baptizo transferred,	25
Scriptural import of the term,	28
Command to baptize an open command,	29
Difference between open and specific command,	32
The main proposition deferred,	35
A question about purifying,	36
Baptism of the Holy Spirit. 1 Cor. xii, 13,	38
Acts xxii, 16; 1 Peter iii, 20, 21,	41, 42
Baptism at the house of Cornelius,	45
Born of water and the Spirit,	48
Baptism of the Holy Ghost and fire,	50

Pentecostal baptism, - - - - - - - - - 51
The three witnesses, - - - - - - - - 56
The golden chain, - - - - - - - - - 60
Mosaic baptisms. Heb. vi, 2; ix, 10, - - - 66, 67
Baptizo means to purify, in Mark vii, 4, 8, and in Luke xi, 38. - - - - - - - - - 76, 80
Baptism in cloud and in the sea. 1 Cor. x, 2, - - - 83
Exposition of Romans vi, 3–11, - - - - - 88, 103
The parallel analogy, - - - - - - - - 113
John's baptism, - - - - - - - - - 118
Difficulties in immersion, - - - - - - - 126
The baptism of Christ - - - - - - - - 133
Baptism at Enon, - - - - - - - - 140, 199
Of the three thousand at Jerusalem, - - - - 147
Philip and the Eunuch, - - - - - - - 152
Paul's baptism, - - - - - - - - - 162
Baptism of the Jailer, - - - - - - - 169
Arminian Testament, - - - - - - - - 181
Dip and dipping — plunge, - - - - - - 182–186

OBJECTIONS TO IMMERSION.

1. Imagination, - - - - - - - - - 201
2. Indelicate and ludicrous, - - - - - 204
3. Unaccommodating, - - - - - - - 212
4. Dangerous to health and life, - - - - 214

Baptisteries, their character and antiquity, - - 226–228
Instructions of the Judge, - - - - - 234
Verdict of the Jury, - - - - - - 238

Pilgrim's Progress